DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 870 SO 019 066

TITLE	Oversight Hearing Regarding the Local Arts Agency Development Program Administered by the National Endowment for the Arts. Hearing before the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. House of Representatives, One Hundredth Congress, First Session (Seattle, Washington).
INSTITUTION	United States Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	25 Aug 87
NOTE	75p.; Serial No. 100-35. Portions contain small print.
AVAILABLE FROM	Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402.
PUB TYPE	Legal/Legislative/Regulatory Materials (090)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Art; *Arts Centers; Cultural Centers; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Financial Support; Government Role; Grants; *Hearings; *Local Government; Public Agencies; Public Support; *State Federal Aid
IDENTIFIERS	Congress 100th; *Local Arts Agency Development Program; *Local Arts Councils; Matching Grants; National Endowment for the Arts

ABSTRACT

The National Endowment for the Arts has supported the Local Arts Agency Development Program since 1984 through a test program funded for $8 million with funds from one-time federal grants and matching state and local funding sources. In many communities the amount of local government financial support exceeded the matching requirements, indicating a growing interaction between local arts agencies and local governments. As a result, the National Endowment for the Arts requested permanent funding for this project, and a hearing was held to determine if this program would sustain arts resources and insure leadership availability and cooperation. Verbal statements were presented by: (1) Frank Hodsoll, Chairperson, National Endowment for the Arts and Chairman, National Council on the Arts; (2) Mike Lowry, Congressman (Washington); (3) Kjristine Lund, Director, King County (Washington) Arts Commission; (4) Judith Meltzer, arts resource specialist, Seattle (Washington) Public Schools; (5) Carl Petrick, Director, Seattle (Washington) Arts Commission; and (6) David E. Skinner, American Council for the Arts representative. Ten prepared statements are also included. (JHP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295870

OVERSIGHT HEARING REGARDING THE LOCAL ARTS AGENCY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

OF THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDREDTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN SEATTLE, WA, ON AUGUST 25, 1987

Serial No. 100-35

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

SO 019 066

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
77-396 WASHINGTON : 1987

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
MARIO BIAGGI, New York
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York
ROBERT E. WISE, Jr., West Virginia
TIMOTHY J. PENNY, Minnesota
BILL RICHARDSON, New Mexico
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
JAMES JONTZ, Indiana
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
STEVE BARTLETT, Texas
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
FRED GRANDY, Iowa
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

PAT WILLIAMS, Montana, *Chairman*

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
CHARLES A. HAYES, Illinois
CARL C. PERKINS, Kentucky
JOSEPH M. GAYDOS, Pennsylvania
TOMMY F. ROBINSON, Arkansas
CHESTER G. ATKINS, Massachusetts
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California
(Ex Officio)
E. THOMAS COLEMAN, Missouri
WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
THOMAS J. TAUKE, Iowa
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
JAMES M. JEFFORDS, Vermont
(Ex Officio)

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearing held in Seattle, WA, on August 25, 1987	1
Statement of:	
Hodsoll, Frank, Chairperson, National Endowment for the Arts; Chairman, National Council on the Arts	3
Lowry, Hon. Mike, a Representative in Congress from the State of Washington	2
Lund, Kjristine, director, King County Arts Commission	37
Meltzer, Judith, arts resource specialist, Seattle Public Schools	49
Petrick, Carl, director, Seattle Arts Commission	44
Skinner, David E., Skinner Corp., Seattle, WA, representing the American Council for the Arts	32
Talbot, Sue, president, Montana Arts Council	17
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
Hodsoll, Frank, Chairperson, National Endowment for the Arts; Chairman, National Council on the Arts, prepared statement of	7
Lund, Kjristine R., director, King County Arts Commission, prepared statement of	40
Meltzer, Judith, arts resource specialist, Seattle Public Schools, prepared statement of	51
Metropolitan Arts Commission, prepared statement of	70
National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, prepared statement of	60
Oregon Coast Council for the Arts, prepared statement of	67
Petrick, Carl J., executive secretary, Seattle Arts Commission, prepared statement of	46
Skinner, David E., prepared statement on behalf of the American Council for the Arts	35
Talbot, Susan, chair, Montana Arts Council, prepared statement of	20
Washington State Arts Commission, prepared statement of	65

OVERSIGHT HEARING REGARDING THE LOCAL ARTS AGENCY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM ADMINISTERED BY THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

TUESDAY, AUGUST 25, 1987

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON POST SECONDARY EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Seattle, WA.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., South Auditorium, Jackson Federal Building, 915 2nd Avenue, Seattle, Washington, Hon. Pat Williams, Chairman, presiding.

Members present. Representatives Williams and Hayes.

Staff present. Gray Garwood, majority staff director; and Larry Zaglaniczny, minority senior legislative associate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Good morning. I am Congressman Pat Williams and am also joined by the Congressman from Chicago, Charlie Hayes.

When I checked into the hotel last night, Charlie, there on the table was a copy of a magazine and your friend, Harold Washington, was staring out at us. So, I was hopeful that you would be with us here today for that and other reasons as well.

In 1970, the number of professional staffed local arts agencies was less than 100. Today, that number exceeds 650. The activities of local arts agencies have increasingly become more integrated with the economic and community development activities of the areas they serve. They now are involved in downtown and neighborhood revitalization, instructional development, facilities management, economic development and promotion, housing, zoning, tourism and education.

Some States have actively encouraged and supported the development of local arts agencies; other States have been somewhat hesitant. The National Endowment for the Arts has informed Congress that although the national distribution of local arts agencies is fairly even, the largest concentration is in Southern and Western States and the smallest is in the New England and mid-American regions. However, 25 States each have less than 10 professionally staffed arts agencies and only 9 States have more than 20 such agencies.

I think most of us would agree that art can be central to a community's character, enrich the lives of its citizens and enhance its reputation as a desirable place to live. But the presence of the arts

also has another effect. A number of new studies have shown that culture can provide a huge economic stimulus. The Marc Chagall exhibition at the Philadelphia Museum of Art last summer, for instance, we are told pumped $7.5 million into that city's economy. A recent Chamber of Commerce study of the economic impact of the arts in Los Angeles showed their direct and indirect impact totaled more than $5 million. Receipts alone were $1.3 million. Thus, the presence of local arts agencies is increasingly seen as contributing to a community's overall social and civic and, yes, economic development.

The National Endowment for the Arts has supported development of local arts agencies since fiscal year 1984 through a test program. The evaluation of this test program indicates that, first, the $8 million in one-time Federal grants is expected to generate $41 million in new and increased State and local public appropriation for the arts.

Second, in many communities, the amount of local government support has actually exceeded the matching requirements of the grant. It appears clear now that the matching grants strategy has leveraged new and substantial increased arts appropriations from State and local government sources.

The National Endowment for the Arts has determined now that the local arts program should be permanent. This decision signals the growing influence and importance of the interaction between local arts agencies and local governments in support and development of the arts. This decision for permanency is an important one and requires attention by the Congress, Federal and State arts agencies, artists, art organizations and community representatives. Therefore, the committee is holding this hearing to help determine if the administrative institutionalization of this test program will sustain our arts resources, insure the availability of leadership, cooperation and collaboration by all parties effected.

We want to review the ramifications of the decision on the potential for increased local government support and improved process for allocation of these resources for the arts and communities throughout the Nation. We welcome the views of those who have been invited to testify here today.

Before we hear from our first witness, let me ask our host, Congressman Mike Lowry, for any opening comments that you wish to make.

STATEMENT OF HON. MIKE LOWRY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Mr. LOWRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I really want to thank you for bringing the committee to Seattle where we have probably the finest art community in the United States. There are a couple of other small cities that argue that, but the art community makes a tremendous contribution to our life here in so many ways, including our economic life. We really appreciate Mr. Hodsoll coming to our city, again. We are very much interested in hearing testimony and taking a look at the program under discussion and how it is working. This is our opportunity to do that. So, thank you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you very much.

Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am just too glad to join with you and my colleague from the Seattle area here, Congressman Lowry. I think any opening remarks I might make would usurp some valuable time that we need in hearing the witnesses. So, let us proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you very much. I might say to Mike, I know of no city larger or smaller that claims to be doing a better job with the arts than is Seattle.

We are delighted that our friend, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts and the Chairman of the National Council on the Arts, Frank Hodsoll, is in Seattle. Frank Hodsoll likes to come to Seattle, and I know why.

Mr. Chairman, we are delighted you are here and please proceed.

STATEMENT OF FRANK HODSOLL, CHAIRPERSON, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS; CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS

Mr. HODSOLL. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

I believe my prepared statement has been submitted for the record and I wonder, if I could, with your indulgence, simply summarize the points made in my statement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Please.

Mr. HODSOLL. Thank you, sir.

First of all, let me say it is a great pleasure to be here in Seattle. Let me begin, by thanking you, Mr. Chairman, and your committee for your interest in the arts, for your leadership in the arts nationally, and, particularly, you, Mr. Chairman, for your own leadership and dedication to the arts.

I might say for the public record that Congressman Williams' concerns extend far beyond the public hearing rooms. He is a guy that you can go and talk to about these issues when you need to. And, for that, we are very grateful, indeed.

I am very glad to be back here in Seattle. There is no question that it is more clement, if I can use that word, here in Seattle than it is in Washington in the Dog Days of August. I even have the temerity to suggest that it would be a good idea to move the Capitol here in the summer. We might all be better off, perhaps; but I do not know. In any event, it is a great pleasure to be here. It is also a great pleasure to join Sue Talbot, the fine Chairman of the Montana Arts Commission and many of the distinguished witnesses from the Seattle area, Carl Petrick, Kjris Lund, Judy Meltzer, and David Skinner.

I have been asked, Mr. Chairman, for comments on our Locals Program, its impact on local arts agencies and on state arts agencies and also to comment on the Locals program process and how that takes in account the differences between urban and rural communities.

First, let me say that it is a matter of philosophy that the arts are local, except the media. That is where they are created, presented, produced, distributed and preserved. This is true everywhere in this country. I think that it is one of the great strengths

of the arts in this country that the local connection is the principal connection because that means that the arts take on all of the diversity of the local communities from which they emerge. They take on the flavors of those communities and, in return, they confer an identity upon those communities. To strengthen these efforts is really the purpose of our local programs.

Seattle is a wonderful example of this. One sees that in the symphony, the opera, the museum, and the extraordinary diversity of its theater, Pacific Northwest Ballet and so many other institutions that are experimenting, like the individuals and groups involved in Performa '87 for which there was a press conference earlier today, are all out and across both Seattle and King County and the State of Washington.

I might note that the Seattle and King County Arts Commissions are both recipients of locals program grants and they have raised from the local communities well over the required match.

In recognition of this diversity and the need to strengthen the local commitment, one of the first things that we did when I became Chairman was to explore the possibility of a program on the local level, building on what the Congress had authorized in 1980.

We launched the program effectively in 1984 and, as you have noted, Mr. Chairman, I think it has been one of the most effective programs we have. Eight million dollars at the Federal level, has gone to 28 local arts agencies and 15 State arts agencies for consortia of local arts agencies in 30 States, helping 198 local arts agencies serving 8,894 arts organizations and 2,539 counties, of which half are small communities under 50,000 in population.

As you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, $8 million has multiplied into $41.2 million in new public funds, plus an additional $15.1 million in private funds. It is a 7-to-1 match as opposed to a 2 to 3-to-1 match; much like our Challenge Program which assists the organizations of most established artistic excellence.

I might note that the $8 million has been given as one-time grants and it is likely that that $41 million in new money will be continuing appropriations for the arts over time. The communities range from New York City to the State of North Dakota and everything in between.

The guidelines of our new program, the program that has evolved out of the Locals Test Program is designed to be flexible in order to be responsive to the concerns of this committee, that we be flexible in supporting many different kinds of communities and that we take into account their unique needs.

In addition to this higher matching program, we have also created two new subprograms within our locals program: a local arts agency development program aimed at improving the professional planning and administrative capabilities of local arts agencies and also, a program designed to improve their services and planning.

It is important, we think, that the local programs interface with State arts agencies, which is another issue you have raised Mr. Chairman. And, so, 15 of the grants in the past have gone to State arts agencies to increase the visibility of the arts within States.

I might note for the record that the National Association of State Arts Agencies has been very supportive of what we are doing in

this area. That has not always been the case as between states and cities and towns.

I think it is particularly important in the rural areas that the States be involved, because States, being closer to the ground, so to speak, than we are at the Federal level, can bring together consortia of smaller communities and thereby multiply the effect of our grants and reduce the amount of the match. Because when we fund a state consortium, we ask for a 1-to-1 match at the state level and then a 1-to-1 match at the local level. So, that, in effect, provides for a smaller contribution at the local level.

It is particularly important, we think, to reach the rural areas at the local level even more so perhaps than reaching the major metropolitan areas.

I might note that we have a number of programs at the Endowment, not just the locals program, that attempt to do that. Our community foundation initiative and the other programs in our Expansion Arts category, the Main Street Program, which with Department of Agriculture money, we launched a program focused on the design of the downtown areas of smaller towns—this program involved 400 towns. Our Mayors Institute, which we are doing in conjunction with the U.S. Conference of Mayors has a lot of small town participation in it. And, of course, our Arts in Education Program is principally aimed at integrating the arts into school districts wherever they may be located. Of course, one of the difficulties in the education area is that there are nearly 16,000 school districts. Again, we have to work through the States, I think, to get down to that.

Let me conclude, if I may, Mr. Chairman, with the reasons why we do all of this. Why we are concerned with arts support in general as well as arts support at the local level? And why, in fact, it is in the national interest?

You have mentioned the economic impact. The arts have an important economic impact. In fact, I might note that in 1985 for the first time revenues from performing arts events exceeded revenues from all professional sporting events. There is a growing interest in the arts across country. The economic impacts of which are enormous. But, even more fundamental than economics or quality of life, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the arts are the expressions of the civilization of a city and then of a civilization of the cities and towns together as represented in a State. And, finally, as the civilization of the United States as represented by all of the States.

And this is really the reason, as our authorizing statute says, as you well know, Mr. Chairman, why it is in the national interest to support the arts, why it is in the State interest to support the arts at the State level and in the local interest to support it at the local level with the taxpayers' monies.

And that is why, finally, arts in education is so important, because if it is truly in the national interest to support these expressions of civilization, they should be a part of everybody's lives. Unfortunately, as we sit here today, 61 percent of Americans do not really participate in the arts which lie outside the popular culture of the moment, prime time television, the top 20 on the record list and so on. And, thus, for the majority of Americans, they are missing the basic elements of our cultural heritage and the majority of

contemporary expression that is ultimately becomes our civilization. And, so, we have to make a greater effort in this area, as well as to make a greater effort in building the strength of local communities to support the arts of their choice.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for this opportunity to appear before you.

[The prepared statement of Frank Hodsoll follows:]

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS
WASHINGTON D.C. 20506
A Federal agency advised by the National Council on the Arts

Statement of

Frank Hodsoll

Chairman,
National Endowment for the Arts

Chairman,
National Council on the Arts

presented before

Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education

Committee on Education and Labor

United States House of Representatives

Seattle, Washington

August 25, 1987

Mr. Chairman, as Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, I am privileged to appear before this Subcommittee to discuss our Endowment arts programs which stimulate support for the arts at the local level. Let me commend you, Mr. Chairman, and the Members of the Subcommittee, for your interest in this matter and for your continuing commitment to our nation's cultural life.

We at the Endowment appreciate the opportunity you have provided for us to discuss this important issue in a public forum. We also welcome the Subcommittee's interest in the contributions the Endowment makes to the arts at the local level through our partnership with regional, state and local arts agencies. I hope our comments will be of assistance to you as you explore issues relating to the arts in localities.

The starting point for discussion is the fact that support for the arts in America has always been, and will continue to be, primarily private and local. The arts are always a part -- and a reflection -- of a place, as well as a time. We may think of the greatest art as timeless and universal, but its presentation, appreciation, and sustenance in any given community requires commitment on the part of that community's artists, and its leadership and citizens. Each community responds to art in its own way, and the kaleidoscopic diversity of the arts is in part a function of the pluralism of the communities from which they emanate.

Local arts support goes back to colonial times, when about 70 playhouses were established -- most with the support of local governments. Over a century ago, localities began to provide the wherewithal for the establishment of museums. In recent decades, both the number and quality of local arts agencies -- some entirely private, some agencies of local government, and some private but officially designated by local government -- have grown exponentially. Today there are approximately 1,500 active local arts agencies in existence. Several years ago they were providing an estimated $300 million or more each year to support local arts activities; today I would guess that the figure may be closer to half a billion dollars.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, the Endowment's authorizing legislation begins by recognizing "that the encouragement and support of national progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts, while primarily a matter for private and local initiative, is also an appropriate matter of concern to the Federal Government". One of my highest priorities, upon assuming the office of Chairman in 1981, was to find a way to expand and invigorate the Endowment's partnership with local arts agencies, consistent with the 1980 amendments to our authorizing statute. To this end, in 1982 we began to formulate plans for a Test Program of Support for Local Arts Agencies, designed to determine whether modest increments of Endowment funding requiring a high match -- both to local arts agencies

directly and to state arts agenices in partnership with consortia of local arts agencies -- could stimulate a substantial increase in local support for the arts. The Locals Test Program was launched in fiscal 1984, and concludes this fiscal year. Its great success has enabled us to establish Local Programs as a permanent Endowment activity, alongside State Programs and Arts in Education in our Office for Public Partnership.

We at the Endowment greatly appreciate the strong support which the Committee has given to the Endowment's growing partnership with local arts agencies. Together, I think we may take considerable satisfaction in the results to date.

From FY'84 through FY'87, the Endowment has made 43 Locals Test Program grants, totalling $8 million, to 28 local arts agencies and 15 State/Local Partnership consortia in 30 states. Through the Program, 198 local arts agencies are serving 8,894 local arts organizations in 2,539 communities -- nearly half of which have populations of under 50,000. We expect that a total of $56.3 million -- $41.2 million in public funds and $15.1 million in private contributions -- will be raised to match the Federal funds. The cumulative match, therefore, is about 7-to-1, which is comparable to the ratio achieved in our Challenge Program by the nation's best arts institutions. Many observers were skeptical about the ability of states and localities to meet the higher matching requirements of this program, but experience has shown that we were right to maintain this high challenge.

Just a year ago, Mr. Chairman, I provided you with a report on our formal evaluation of the Locals Test Program conducted by a team from the Center for Research and Advanced Study at the University of Southern Maine. The evaluation substantiated our belief that the initiative deserved a permanent place among Endowment Programs. Apart from the basic finding that the Program was effective in levering new and substantially increased arts appropriations from local government, the evaluation brought to light several key facts:

First, support for local arts organizations was by far the principal purpose to which Locals Test Program funds were put. Fifty-six percent of our grant funds were regranted for this purpose, while 17 percent were applied to special projects such as arts facilities; 8 percent were used to support festivals, performances and exhibitions sponsored by local arts agencies; and 19 percent were applied to such purposes as arts services, artist residencies, and local program administration.

Second, communities of all sizes are being served. Over 20 percent of participating local arts agencies served rural communities with populations under 10,000.

Third, the Program was reaching a demographically diverse population as well -- perhaps a quarter of participating LAA's were empahsizing support for artists and arts activites in minority, ethnic, and/or "special constituency" communities.

And fourth, the evaluation found that local regrant procedures were both thorough and extensive, with important new resources reaching arts programs outside the scope of traditional institutional support.

Let me provide a few examples. In Durham, North Carolina, Program funds were used to establish the Durham Community Arts Center -- as well as to increase the Durham Arts Council's grants to local arts organizations, develop new audiences, provide commissions for visual and performance art at the new center, and enhance the Council's programming activites.

In New York City, the Department of Cultural Affairs used Program funds to establish the Greater New York Arts Development Fund which greatly increases financial support for organizations that previously had limited access to Federal, state and local arts funding. Just to the north, the Council for the Arts in Westchester County employed Program funds for several innovative purposes including the implementation of a long-term arts marketing program and the initiative of a process which has put the arts officially on the County's planning agenda.

In Alabama, the State Council on the Arts and Humanities has used Program funds, in conjunction with a consortium of local arts agencies, to reach both rural and urban audiences with a diversity of high-quality arts activities made possible by cooperative planning and funding.

In a prototype for our Challenge III Program, the Wisconsin Arts Board and participating LAA's used Program funds to develop a state Challenge Grant Program that builds institutional health, enhances artistry, and expands audiences in areas of the state that have not previously received arts funding.

The North Dakota Council on the Arts is using Program funds to develop a network of vigorous LAA's throughout the state's extensive rural areas -- as well as to create and renovate local arts facilities, purchase essential arts equipment, and support local arts organizations and professional artists.

In Springville, Utah -- a small community already renowned for its commitment to artistic excellence -- Program funds are enabling the local Arts Commission to fund the International Folk Dance Festival held annually in Springville, renovate an arts center facility, create an arts park and outdoor ampitheater, and expand a regrant program. Simultaneously, the Salt Lake City Arts Council is using a Program grant to undertake a multi-faceted program that includes an interesting urban design component.

Here in Seattle, which has long been a national model for local arts administration, Program funds are helping the two local arts agencies, the Seattle Arts Commission and the Kings County Arts Commission, to expand their programs. The Seattle Arts Commisssion has used its Program grant to expand its regranting program to reach both major arts institutions and emerging organizations; create a "Traditional Arts" regrant category; reinstitute and expand both technical assistance and an arts education program; and increase access to the city's public art collection, including a new Municipal Arts Gallery.

The King County Arts Commission has used their Program grant to lay the foundation for an exciting performing arts festival, PERFORMA '87. This festival sets the stage for the world premiere of 21 new works in dance, music, theater and performance. Many of these performances will take place in non-traditional settings such as Metro buses, airplane terminals, and county parks; others will be set in theaters and symphony halls. In conjunction with the Festival, the Commission has developed an education program which introduces various aspects of the arts to school children and community groups.

Mr. Chairman, I think these examples show that local arts support has become an ambitious, complex and widely varying undertaking. The approach to municipal funding of the arts of an earlier era -- support directed chiefly to public arts events -- is increasingly giving way to a more sophisticated and integrated approach involving local arts agencies, artists and civic leaders in long-range cultural planning and development. Local arts agencies are involved in design, downtown and neighborhood revitalization, institutional development, facilities management, economic development and promotion, housing, zoning, tourism and education. Funding for arts organizations and programs is increasingly being linked to long-range institutional and community goals. Creative use by local arts agencies of cultural districts, hotel-motel tax revenues, regional cooperative ventures, and joint city-county initiatives offers the potential of significantly expanded local resources for artists and arts organizations and greater opportunities to make art available to a broad public.

We tried to keep these considerations in mind, Mr. Chairman, in devising guidelines for Local Programs. We also wanted the new guidelines to reflect the invaluable experience we gained through the Locals Test Program, and to be responsive to the concerns of the Committee. The guidelines are intentionally flexible, so that they can adapt to new needs and opportunities in the local arts agency field.

The purpose of this now permanent program is to enhance the quality and availability of the arts by fostering the expansion

of local arts resources. There are two Program categories: Local Government Incentive Grants, and Local Arts Agency Development. The former category essentially continues the thrust of the Test Program -- a high matching program which encourages local government initiatives to improve and expand the planning, allocation, and development of local arts resources. These grants permit local arts agenices to develop long-range programs of support for the arts on a community, county, or multi-county basis; State/Local Grants permit state arts agencies to develop proposals on behalf of LAA consortia.

The Local Arts Agency Development category encourages applications for the improvement of professional, planning, and administrative capabilities of LAA's. Leadership Education and Services Grants assist national service organizations, state assemblies, and institutions of higher education to develop significant educational programs, services, and research for the local arts agency field. In addition, a new Planning and Administrative Grants category provides an opportunity for LAA's to improve their administrative and planning capabilities, and for state arts agencies to expand their community development staff and their services to LAA's. As you know, Mr. Chairman, these new provisions reflect needs expressed by local arts administrators for several years; we think they will significantly enhance the effectiveness of Local Programs.

Local Programs are a visible and important part of our efforts to support the arts at the local level. I should note, however, that most of our other Endowment programs also enhance the quality and broaden audiences for the arts at the local level. One such Endowment program is the Expansion Arts Program's Community Foundation Initiative (CFI). The purpose of this initiative is to stimulate the development of endowments within community foundations for the local support of small and medium-sized arts organizations. Grants are made directly to community foundations which must match them on a 2:1 basis with new and increased private contributions. During the grant period, which may extend up to four years, Endowment funds are regranted to eligible arts organizations, while matching funds are placed in an endowment restricted to long-term support of emerging arts organizations, with a heavy emphasis upon those rooted in minority communities. Following the grant period, the community foundation will continue to support local programming with income from the endowment.

Thus far the program has proved highly successful; fifteen community foundations have established endowed restricted funds. We have recently awarded an additional six grants under this initiative, making the total number of participating community foundations twenty-one. At a minimum, these 21 participating community foundations will within four years have endowments totaling $8 million for emerging arts organizations.

The CFI has two benefits -- it generates funds for emerging arts organizations, and second serves as a magnet to donors who otherwise would have no practical means of contributing to such local arts organizations. The purpose of the Federal stimulus is to develop local commitment for local emerging groups, to foster relationships between the established and the unestablished.

For example, the Rochester Area Foundation in Rochester, NY, was awarded a $25,000 grant under the Program. The Rochester initiative was so well received that the Foundation received private sector commitments equal to the required 2:1 match of $50,000 by the time the grant was announced. The Foundation has advised the Expansion Arts Program that donors see the program as a means of assisting local groups of which they would otherwise be unaware.

Another example is the New Hampshire Charitable Fund in Concord, NH. This program is particularly significant because it creates a model for other rural or regional foundations. The Charitable Fund has developed a program which addresses the needs of the quite distinct southern and northern areas of the state, with subgranting funds for thirteen small and medium-sized rural arts organizations.

Mr. Chairman, as you know, the aesthetic design of a community can contribute importantly to the quality of life in a city or town. Design concepts and techniques evolve from the arts. In addition to the Design Arts Program's ongoing categories of support of excellence in the field of design, the Program has established initiatives specifically oriented to improving the quality of design in communities across the Nation.

Since 1977, the Endowment has supported various aspects of the National Trust for Historic Preservation's Main Street Project -- through grants to the National Trust and to various communities involved in the Project. This is a highly successful program aimed at helping smaller communities to develop comprehensive revitalization strategies so as to encourage economic development. In 1984, in conjunction with the Department of Agriculture's office of Rural Development Policy, the Endowment sponsored a Main Street Project video-conference on community revitalization in which approximately 400 towns participated. The conference was viewed by approximately 25,000 people in cable video re-runs.

Recently, the Design Arts Program has established a very fruitful relationship with the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the University of Virginia and the Jefferson Institute in Los Angeles. The centerpiece is the Mayors' Institute of City Design -- a series of conferences at the University of Virginia on issues and resources affecting the importance of quality'

77-396 0 - 87 - 2

design in American cities. Since the first conference in October of 1986, thirteen mayors from communities ranging in population from 45,000 to over 500,000 have participated. We believe that this program is having a very positive impact on the design policies of our municipal leaders.

Mr. Chairman, the Endowment is strongly committed to encouraging the development of an arts presence in America's small towns and rural communities. To this end, the Endowment joined the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies in sponsoring a Rural Arts Information Exchange in Portland, Oregon, this past June. In addition to local arts agencies, regional organizations, state assemblies, and state arts agency community development coordinators, the Exchange included key representatives of rural colleges and universities, libraries, and agricultural and educational extension services. Valuable information and insights were shared, and some very important networking took place. We believe that broad collaboration of this type is essential to providing sustained access to a diversity of artistic excellence in small towns and rural areas.

We are considering a number of additional approaches to increasing the effectiveness of Federal support for the arts in rural America -- of special significance, I think, are the "Access" and "Non-Federal Support Systems" components of our Challenge III Program. Initial Challenge III grants will be made in FY'88/89, and we have received eight applications from local arts agencies to this Program.

Another issue of enormous importance to local arts activity is arts education. With your encouragement, Mr. Chairman, the Endowment has launched our revised Arts in Education (AIE) Program, which seeks to encourage making the arts a serious and sequential part of basic education. While education reform is chiefly a state and local responsiblity and the Endowment is not an education agency, we hope, in cooperation with state arts agencies and state education authorities, to make some progress. By virtue of the role that local arts agencies play in communities, they can assist in generating support -- in local school districts and in particular schools -- for AIE initiatives.

As I have previously testified, the national importance of arts education is illuminated by our survey of Public Participation in the Arts, which showed that in 1982 61% of American adults did not attend, even once, any live performance of jazz or classical music, theater, opera, musical theater, or ballet, nor visit an art gallery or museum. While the fact that 39% of American adults did participate during that year shows progress, we believe that the Congressional declaration of purpose for the Endowment -- that "high civilization must...give full value and support to the other great branches of scholarly and cultural

activity in order to achieve a better understanding of the past, a better analysis of the present, and a better view of the future..." -- requires us to do everything we can to make the arts more a part of the lives of all Americans. The Arts in Education Program, with its crucial focus on local responsibility and initiative, will, we hope, be important in this regard.

Mr. Chairman, I've devoted considerable attention to how the Endowment assists local communities support their arts. Now before I close, I'd like to say a few words about why we do so.

Perhaps the most commonly advanced argument for supporting the arts is that they do much to enchance the "quality of life" -- and so they do. No one doubts that Seattle is a better city, or Washington a better state, or America a better Nation, because of the arts. Clearly, any community is a more appealing place in which to live and work if the arts flourish there; and clearly our lives are richer and fuller when the arts are part of them. "Quality of life", therefore, is a perfectly good argument for supporting the arts -- whether at the Federal, state, or local level. But for our purposes there is something not quite satisfactory about this formulation -- it's a little too easy, a little too amorphous, and perhaps a little too condescending. We don't want the arts to be confused with designer jeans and jacuzzies, and we don't support the arts just because they make people feel good inside.

Another popular argument for arts support is that the arts produce economic benefits. Again, there's a lot of truth in that. There are dozens of economic impact studies showing that the arts positively benefit local economies, and that arts expenditures generate multiple returns -- in ripple-effect spending, tourist dollars, jobs, tax revenues, et cetera. In many states and cities one dollar spent on the arts brings three or four additional dollars into the economy. The location of so many leading corporations in Seattle, and their participation in local arts giving, indicates their conviction that the arts are good business, and good for business. The economic argument for arts support is a powerful one for state and local government as well as for business and industry. It's clear that this argument is also persuasive in the halls of Congress, where the local impact of Federal expenditures is always of great concern -- and that's entirely legitimate. From a cultural and aesthetic perspective, however, the economic argument is also not really satisfactory.

There is, I believe, a far more profound justification for supporting the arts. I refer here to what Samuel Lipman, a distinguished member of the National Council on the Arts, calls the "enduring values of culture and civilization". The arts and humanities are of crucial and permanent importance to us -- to

all of us, as individuals and as members of American society -- because they teach us who we are, and what we can be. They lie at the very core of our civilization, and they provide the foundation from which we may reach out to other cultures and civilizations so that the great heritage that is ours may be enriched and augmented by the achievements of other enduring traditions.

At the heart of our appeal for wider and deeper partnership in supporting the arts, therefore, is a quest not only for greater appreciation of art, but also for an understanding of a reality beyond the flux of present-day events, an appreciation of the past which illuminates our present, a comprehension of what it is in the present which enables us to face the future with hope and with a deeper perception of what we are and what our world is. This is why the arts and humanities should be at the core of what is taught in our schools, of what our children read, and of the way in which we see our society and our great country. It is why artistic excellence must always be the paramount concern of the National Endowment for the Arts, and it is why we at the Endowment, and our public partners, give such high priority to encouraging serious and sequential arts curricula as a basic part of public and private school education.

If Americans are to apprehend and reach for the highest standards, they must be introduced to the historical continuum of genius that underlies the best in art and in artistic innovation. They must have some sense of the vocabularies of the highest achievements of civilization -- of the past as well as of the present.

In this sense we may say that those of us who have responsibility for public arts support are engaged in what John F. Kennedy called "our contribution to the human spirit". This is just as true of arts support at the state and local level as it is of Federal cultural support. Our common goal is to create a community in St. Augustine's sense -- that is, "an association of reasonable beings united in the peaceful sharing of the things they cherish".

This is the way it was in Athens under Pericles, in Renaissance Florence under the Medicis, in the Ming Dynasty under Tai-Tsu and in Elizabethan London. It is just as true here today in Seattle, and in countless other vibrant communities across America.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate having had this opportunity to share with the Committee my thoughts on the Endowment's role in supporting the arts in localities across our nation. I would be delighted to respond to the Committee's questions.

Thank you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Before we have questions of you, I would like to ask Ms. Sue Talbot now to join you at the hearing table. Ms. Talbot is the Chair of the Montana Arts Council and it is not entirely ironic that she is a constituent of mine.

Sue, it is nice to see you here. We appreciate you coming over and we would be pleased now to have your testimony.

STATEMENT OF SUE TALBOT, PRESIDENT, MONTANA ARTS COUNCIL

Ms. TALBOT. Representative Williams and members of the committee, for the record, I am Ms. Susan Talbot, Chair of the Montana Arts Council, a position which I have held since 1984.

I am here today to make a presentation to this committee regarding the National Endowment for the Arts-Local Arts Agency Development Program.

The Montana Arts Council agrees that local arts agencies play an important role nationally and have an ability to be involved in long-range cultural planning, economic development, facilities management and neighborhood or downtown revitalization.

In fact, our Council staff views as its next major development effort the creation and strengthening of Local Arts Agencies in Montana's cities, counties and multicounty regions. This is of special concern because we believe that a strong network of Local Arts Agencies can play an important role in building support for the arts and in helping to create diversity in Montana's presently distressed economy which is in large part based on the extraction of natural resources and agriculture.

While the Council is poised to begin this critical next stage of Montana's arts development, it realizes that funds will be needed above and beyond those currently available in the state. We are ready to apply the Endowment's Local Programs for a Planning and Administrative grant and, ultimately, a State-Local Consortium grant.

However, the Council is stymied by the Endowment's Local Program's guideline which requires a 2-to-1 match in new Government funds and a minimum grant request of $150,000. I should like to add that recently in Missoula, which is the third largest city in the State with a strong commitment to support of the arts, $50,000 was raised for a very popular international choral festival only after a herculean effort. I speak to that personally. $300,000 is a gigantic sum for a Montana community to raise. You might be able to do it for a new hospital.

These guidelines do not appear to allow flexibility for special case situations such as exist in Montana. We think this is also likely to be true of other States with poor economic climates, legislatively imposed limits on taxing authority or scarce private funds. It is important to recognize that Montana has no major corporation with headquarters in the State, for example.

Montana is unique because during the late 1960's and early 1970's, it encouraged the development of arts councils which quickly evolved into visual arts centers. Montana well knows the importance of local government support of the arts. For since 1945, the State has had legislation which allows a permissive county mill to

be levied for county-owned museums. In 1967, the first arts center was funded from this source, which was recently increased to two mills by the Montana Legislature. Approximately $1 million in county funds supports Montana's art centers and museums in 1987. One of the most important consequences of this revenue source is that these centers have dependable funding to employ paid staff.

In 1975, the Montana Legislature established a cultural trust which in 1987 generated $600,000 in grants from interest income for Montana's arts and cultural organizations. This grant program places Montana as second in the Nation in support of the arts as a percentage of total government expenditures. However, these funds are in jeopardy each legislative session, and must be fought for continually. The Council considers it "new" money each biennium that it is appropriated. It is unrealistic to assume that the Montana Legislature will make any substantial additional commitment of funds.

We are proud of the level of funding for the arts which already exists in our State of 860,000 people and are most pleased that the 1987 legislature saw fit to maintain it in face of Montana's severe economic crisis. Grants from the State's cultural trust have enabled the significant growth of Montana's mosaic of arts organizations. We have the necessary arts system in place to move the State significantly ahead. However, Montana's cultural trust cannot provide all the necessary capital. Because foundation and corporation giving is very difficult to obtain in Montana, the National Endowment for the Arts serves as an important grant source for us. However, the Local Programs guidelines do not reflect an awareness and sensitivity to special case situations. We request that our accomplishments be recognized and that our State not be penalized for its success which predates the National Endowment for the Arts Local Programs.

We are aware that previous Local Arts Agency grants were given to a number of States on the assumption that they would serve Local Arts Agencies in both small and large communities. However, it is our opinion that States such as Montana which are primarily rural without major urban areas—our largest city, Billings, has only 100,000 people—deserve to be considered on a case-by-case basis by the Endowment and the matching requirements modified as appropriate.

As I began to outline in my February 2, 1987, letter to you, when rural communities or States are also impacted by a severe economic climate and taxing limitations, a situation is created which essentially excludes them from making application to this most important program. These consequences are not surprising in that we think that the Locals Program was developed using Urban Local Arts Agencies as models which, even in times of economic stagnation, often have access to public or private funds not readily accessed by rural States. We appeal to this committee to strongly encourage the National Endowment for the Arts to modify its guidelines so as to allow a diversity of models to be funded which address a variety of needs and situations.

Currently, there is a good chance that the Montana Arts Council will be awarded a 3-year grant by the National Endowment for the Arts adequate to develop professional staffing for the Fort Peck

Fine Arts Council in Glasgow, Montana. We are proud of the tenacity of this Local Arts Agency in making its case to the Endowment and providing them with an opportunity to grant funds from the Locals Program to a Local Arts Agency in an isolated, rural area. It must be recognized, however, that to make this grant, the Endowment will have to substantially modify its guidelines both in matching requirements and minimum grant amount.

This one grant does not solve the Local Arts Agency development problem in Montana. A more extensive, statewide effort is needed, but this would require that the Endowment pay serious attention to the overall situation that exists in our State and be willing to be flexible in its definitions of "new" government money and its basic matching requirements. It is our strong belief that support of Local Arts Agency development now during hard economic times will encourage the leveraging of additional local governmental support when Montana's economy improves. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Susan Talbot follows:]

MONTANA **ARTS** COUNCIL

August 25, 1987

Representative Pat Williams, Chairman
Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
U.S. House of Representatives
617 House Office Building, Annex #1
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Representative Williams and members of the committee:

For the record, I am Mrs. Susan Talbot, Chair, of the Montana Arts Council, a position which I have held since 1984. I am here today to make a presentation to this committee regarding the National Endowment for the Arts-Local Arts Agency (LAA) development program. I will leave my complete written comments with the committee secretary.

The Montana Arts Council agrees that Local Arts Agencies play an important role nationally and have an ability to be involved in long range cultural planning, economic development, facilities management, and neighborhood or downtown revitalization.

In fact, our Council staff views as its next major development effort, the creation and strengthening of Local Arts Agencies in Montana's cities, counties and multi-county regions. This is of special concern, for we believe that a strong network of Local Arts Agencies can play an important role in building support for the arts and in helping to create diversity in Montana's presently distressed economy, an economy which is in large part based on the extraction of natural resources and agriculture.

While the Council is poised to begin this critical next stage of Montana's arts development, it realizes that funds will be needed above and beyond those currently available in the state. We are ready to apply to the Endowment's Local Programs for a Planning and Administrative grant and ultimately a State-Local Consortium grant. However, the Council is stymied by the Endowment's Local Programs guidelines which require a 2:1 match in new government funds, and a minimum grant request of $150,000. That, recently in Missoula, which is the third largest city in the state with a strong commitment to support of the arts, $50,000 was raised for a very popular international choral festival only after a herculean effort. $300,000 is a gigantic sum for a Montana community to raise. You might be able to do it for a new hospital. These guidelines don't appear to allow flexibility for special case situations such as exist in Montana. We think this is also likely to be true in other states with poor economic climates,

35 SOUTH LAST CHANCE GULCH HELENA, MONTANA 59620 406-444-6430

legislatively imposed limits on taxing authority, or scarce private funds. It is important to recognize that Montana has no major corporation with headquarters in the state.

Montana is unique, because during the late 1960s and early 1970s it encouraged the development of arts councils, which quickly evolved into visual art centers. Montana well knows the importance of local governmental support of the arts, for since 1945 the state has had legislation which allows a permissive county mill to be levied for county owned museums. In 1967, the first art center was funded from this source which was recently increased to two mills by the Montana legislature. Approximately one million dollars in county funds supports Montana's art centers and museums in 1987. One of the most important consequences of this revenue source is that these centers have dependable funding to employ paid staff.

In 1975, the Montana legislature established a cultural trust which in 1987 generated $600,000 in grants from interest income for Montana's arts and cultural organizations. This grant program places Montana as second in the nation in support of the arts as a percentage of total government expenditures. However, these funds are in jeopardy during each legislative session, and must continually be fought for. The Council considers it "new" money each biennium it is appropriated. It is unrealistic to assume that the Montana legislature will make any substantial additional commitment of funds.

We are proud of the level of funding for the arts which already exists in our state of 860,000 people and are most pleased that the 1987 legislature saw fit to maintain it in face of Montana's severe economic crisis. Grants from the state's cultural trust have enabled the significant growth of Montana's mosaic of arts organizations. We have the necessary arts system in place to move the state significantly ahead. However, Montana's cultural trust cannot provide all the necessary capital. Because foundation and corporation giving is very difficult to obtain in Montana, the National Endowment for the Arts serves as an important grant source for us. However, the Local Programs guidelines do not reflect an awareness and sensitivity to special case situations. We request that our accomplishments be recognized and that our state not be penalized for its success which predates the National Endowment for the Arts Local Programs.

We are aware that previous Local Arts Agency grants were given to a number of states on the assumption that they would serve Local Arts Agencies in both large and small communities. However, it is our opinion that states such as Montana which are primarily rural without major urban areas, -- our largest city, Billings, has only 100,000 people -- deserve to be considered on a case-by-case basis by the Endowment and the matching requirements modified as appropriate.

As I began to outline in my February 2, 1987 letter to you, when rural

communities or states are also impacted by a severe economic climate and taxing limitations, a situation is created which essentially excludes them from making application to this most important program. These consequences are not surprising in that we think the Local Programs was developed using urban Local Arts Agencies as models which (even in times of economic stagnation) often have access to public or private funds not readily accessed by rural states. We appeal to this committee to strongly encourage the National Endowment for the Arts to modify its guidelines so as to allow a diversity of models to be funded which address a variety of needs and situations.

Currently, there is a good chance that the Montana Arts Council will be awarded a three year grant by the National Endowment for the Arts adequate to develop professional staffing for the Fort Peck Fine Arts Council in Glasgow, Montana. We are proud of the tenacity of this Local Arts Agency in making its case to the Endowment and providing them with an opportunity to grant funds from the Local Programs to a Local Arts Agency in a isolated, rural area. It must be recognized, however, that to make this grant, the Endowment will have to substantially modify its guidelines both in matching requirements and minimum grant amount.

This one grant does not solve the Local Arts Agency development problem in Montana. A more extensive, statewide effort is needed, but this would require that the Endowment pay serious attention to the overall situation that exists in our state and be willing to be flexible in its definitions of "new" government money and its basic matching requirements. It is our strong belief that support of Local Arts Agency development nor during hard economic times will encourage the leveraging of additional local governmental support when Montana's economy improves.

Sincerely,

Susan Talbot

Mrs. Susan Talbot, Chair
Montana Arts Council

ST/sbr

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Hodsoll, you mention the Arts in Education effort and, as you know, I have expressed a considerable interest in that program. Give the committee, if you will, your views about how the Federal supports to arts programming in education has produced changes, if you are able to document, in the way arts are presented in the schools now versus what they might have been before the effort was begun.

Mr. HODSOLL. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. Our program is just beginning, so, I cannot really document specific changes at this point. However, I can say that since we started the program officially about a year ago, that 42 of the 50 States have applied to be a part of the program and we have awarded 16 planning grants to 16 of those States. The completed plans will be coming in as collaborations between the State departments of education and the State arts agencies about the middle of next year.

Based on those plans, we will have a better sense of precisely what we can accomplish. One of the things that the plans will do is identify specific school districts where, as a part of the planning process, it is at least apparent that the school districts want to move forward with more basic and sequential arts education as a part of their regular programs. We will have a better sense of that, as I say, next year.

Secondly, we are, as you know, sir, at your request, providing to the Congress in December, a report on the State of arts education which will include recommendations on additional things we might do. And, hopefully, that report will also provide additional indications of future directions.

That is where we are. Now, let me make a guess. My guess is that if we are very lucky, that we will be able in the next couple of years to develop relationships with quite a few different kinds of school districts across the country which will result in their adopting the arts as basic and sequential with requirements as to what is needed to graduate in the arts with courses that are required as well as optional, with additional training for teachers. This will be particularly important in elementary schools where the classroom teacher often does not have any training in the arts at all. But he or she is, pretty much, the essential teacher, the teacher that is there the most with regard to all of the subjects and so on.

The critical thing here, I believe, Mr. Chairman, is to convince school districts that it is in their interest to do this. The argument that I make has many different ramifications to it, but one of them, it seems to me, is that it has never been a question in this country that we teach literature as a part of English. If all that we wished to do in the English curriculum was to simply teach reading and writing, we would not need to have people read Shakespeare or Whitman or Carlos Williams or whoever you like to name from the literary greats.

We teach people literature because they were the best writers, because they were the writers that not only knew how to use the form of writing, but also who captured the essential elements of the society and of the human questions that transcend societies over time.

We do that because it is the art of writing that is represented there. And, so, I argue that similarly, particularly in an age where

television imagery and the like is becoming more and more important as elements of communication, that we also teach young people the art of what they see, the art of what they hear, the art of movement, et cetera, from all of the points of view that I have expressed.

It is interesting to me, Mr. Chairman, that in a time of educational reform, and we have had five regional meetings around the country talking to a lot of educators, not just people from the arts community, that the vast majority of the people I talked to—and I am talking about superintendents of public instruction at the State level, I am talking about local school board members and the like, at least on the surface say, "We agree with you." The problem is the translation of that into the resources of time and money.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, about this time next year when we have these 16 plans, we will be in a better position to report to you how much commitment we can actually engender out there.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Could the arts in education dollars be used more effectively if they were provided as block grants to either local agencies or schools who applied to provide a specific type of instruction?

Mr. HODSOLL. Well, the State arts in education grants, which is the bulk of our program, are provided, not as block grants, per se, but as grants that the States can use for whatever purposes they like in accordance with Federal criteria stated in the guidelines, which is somewhat between a block grant which says: "Take this money and go use it for education in any way that you wish." And our saying at the Federal level to the State: "We would like you to do a program for 4th graders in the following school with the following components to it."

Essentially, our program suggests is that there will be incentives in our program for States that use these moneys to establish sequential programs with learning outcomes as opposed to the more extra-curricular kind of arts education that prevails in so many of our schools.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the Endowment's concern, if any, about developing art curriculum? Is there a concern that that might block the creative force with regard to art education?

Mr. HODSOLL. Well, I think, sir, that at least from my perspective, it would probably be inappropriate to try and develop a "Federal curriculum," in the same sense it would probably be inappropriate for the Department of Education to do such a thing.

I think what we have to do in the arts is to identify and give visibility to and disseminate curricula that have worked in different ways for different purposes in the arts. One of the things that is lacking in arts education that is less lacking—I will not say that it is totally there in the other subjects, but that is more lacking than, say, in English or History or Physics or whatever, is that there is no consensus in those who are involved with arts education as to what the curriculum generally speaking ought to be. It is everything from playing the tuba in the football band to drawing at the third grade level to an art history course in the eleventh grade or whatever.

There is a great need and when I go out in the country and talk to people and people say to me: "Well, Frank, we think this is a

good idea but how do we do this? What are the models that we can use?"

And I ask questions: "Well, are there any models?" And there is no consensus as to what the models are.

So, I hope that we at the Endowment can help. We have an agreement now with the U.S. Department of Education, with their money coming into it, joining our money, to establish a center at an institution of higher education that will help to bring together these various curricula, also include research on new curricula and provide a place where a local school district can go if they are interested in pursuing arts education on a basic and sequential basis and have a menu of choices from which they can choose, with evaluation of what those choices might result in as well.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Respond, if you will, Frank, to Ms. Talbot's concern about the potential stymie involved with the requirement for the 2-to-1 match. And, also, if you will, respond to a concern I have had that the requirement that agencies be professionally staffed makes it difficult for some small communities who cannot find the financial resources to do that.

Mr. HODSOLL. First of all, on the 2-to-1 match that Ms. Talbot has mentioned. First, if I could do a bit of history and then make a case for why we do it the way we do without in any way denigrating from the concerns that exist in the State of Montana or similar States.

Before we started this program, when we were investigating this program in 1983, we had quite a debate within the National Council on the Arts on just this point and other issues related to matching. There were some who thought that we should have a less stringent matching requirement and/or a more flexible matching requirement. There were some who thought that private match should be a part of it as opposed to just public match, and so on and there were also those who thought that the match ought to be perhaps even higher than what it is now and it should be a tremendous leverage kind of program.

The outcome of that discussion was the program that we currently have based on the feeling that if we presented a real challenge to local communities wherever situated and however situated, that it would give those in the arts community who were for raising money at the local level or the State level, as the case may be, a lever from the Federal Government that they could go forward and say: "Hey, fellows, we can get a large sum, a sum that is significant in governmental terms, $150,000." Because remember, we are talking about governments that are dealing with hundreds of millions of dollars when you talk about police and fire and health and sanitation and so on and so forth, a significant sum. And they could go in and say: "We can get this if you will raise this additional money."

We also agreed when we instituted the program that if there was an enormous problem out there that we would rethink it.

Well, we believe, sir, that after the first 4 years of the program with that match, all kinds of communities have been able to participate. That is why we did not change the match, and the evaluation by the University of Southern Maine, it would appear to buttress our decision.

I believe, I mentioned, that half of the communities that have received monies under this are communities with less than 50,000 people in them. Just to mention a few: Durham, North Carolina; the Alabama State Arts Council; the State of Louisiana; Nebraska; Oregon. I remember the Oregon proposal because I was out there at the time they were drawing together the communities—more than half in numbers, were tiny communities. Some of them communities of 5,000 people. The Oregon Arts Commission brought them all together.

Let's see. North Dakota was very similar. Springville Arts Commission in Springville, Utah; Jackson in Jackson, Mississippi; Arkansas Arts Council. These are rural areas, sir.

Basically, we found that we had enormous representation through the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies, we found that this lever was in fact working and that it provided a tool for the advocates at the State and local level to raise the money.

For that reason, we felt that we should stick to this kind of program because for those who do use it, it allows them to raise more money with the Federal carrot.

The second point that you mentioned, sir, was the professionalization of local arts agencies. There is no question that this is a problem. There are many local arts agencies which simply are getting started or they have not been able to afford to hire somebody on a professional basis. What they do is based entirely on a voluntary activity and, while the voluntary activity is very much something that comes of the people and therefore is an enormous strength for the organization it also has an enormous weakness in that there is nobody there to answer the phones and carry through after the people from the community sat down at a meeting or whatever and decided what they wanted to do. And, so, our new Locals Program does provide in its two new categories for specific grants, not on a high match basis, on a regular match basis, specific grants to local arts agencies and to states for local arts agencies to upgrade and to provide the possibility of employing somebody at least on a part-time basis to help with this problem.

We are also going to provide through institutions of higher education, summer institutes for the local arts councils. The purpose of these institutes will be the sharing of information and technique and what has worked and what has not worked with their colleagues in the hopes that they will be able to benefit from that and create a stronger local effort when they get back.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ms. Talbot, does a 2-to-1 match not require local advocates to more aggressively pursue financing. And, if that requirement was not there, would there not be, candidly, less hustle on the part of the local advocates to go out and raise the money?

Ms. TALBOT. Well, I do not know. The choral festival of which I spoke, there was no outside leverage. It was local people and local volunteers who hustled for two years to raise a little over $50,000. I do appreciate what Mr. Hodsoll was saying about the leverage of Federal funds. I would like, however, to quote from the University of Maine report that he mentioned.

Proposition H: "A degree of substitution, the redirection of arts funds originally intended for other purposes to the Local Test Pro-

gram exists with regard to state and local matching, despite the programmatic emphasis on new public funding."

They have encountered examples of this at State and local levels. And they say that substitution is more often a phenomenon of economically depressed jurisdictions. We are a little bit afraid that sometimes that match requirement may mean that money which originally went into the arts from one source is just being shifted and that we are not indeed leveraging any new money.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Hayes?

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have listened with great interest to the two witnesses. I think they have given us some excellent testimony.

I do not want to sound like a pessimist, you know, but I have to be real. When I, as a Member of Congress, witness what I see to be the trend today of trying to do everything we can to reduce this huge Federal deficit and sometime, as you well know, Pat, and so does Mike, the approaches they use are not too humane, I call it. Realistic in some respects.

I think it is remarkable that you have been able to—and $8 million is not a lot of money. Not a lot of money. We tend to lose that amount in some instances.

But when you sit and listen as I have had to do, and so have some of my colleagues, for a 45-minute debate on how we can eliminate 13 elevators from the office building which I occupy in order to conserve a little over $100,000, you wonder what the mentality is of some of our people who talk about reducing the deficit.

My big point is that it is programs such as this, funding for it and matching we have put up at Federal levels, as I have said, is not very much. They are the ones that are usually attacked first when they talk about reducing spending.

The big question that you mentioned, Mr. Hodsoll, the quality of life which I am interested in and Ms. Talbot mentioned the State of Montana, its economic problems. I represent a district that is better than half the size of the whole State and population of Montana where the ratio of unemployment is I would say roughly 16 to 18 percent. Among our youth, it must be better than 50 percent with a drop-out ratio of kids who enter as freshmen and do not finish high school that hovers around 50 percent. Yet, we find ourselves in a struggle trying to just retain some of those programs that benefit those economically deprived kids. There are some who do not eat until they go to school. That is when they have breakfast. And money for these programs is under attack.

What I am trying to say is that—and when you move on beyond those who struggle through high school, support programs for financing the post-secondary education of those kids is under attack, too. Yet, we fit into—in order for them to fit into this society and I feel that the best security we can have is to educate and prepare our youth to take over the responsibility of guiding the destiny of this great nation of ours—as I look at the local programs that you have addressed yourselves to here, the course of support for major cultural organizations which are already receiving National Endowment for the Arts funds, are support for those multi-cultural groups of emerging art groups such as Blacks and Hispanics and other groups who are not heavily receiving Federal dollars, hard

dollars, what we do—what are we doing to include them in these kind of programs, if it is possible? And I think it should be. I just think that it would be more likely that we could maybe continue on our current pace to improve the arts program and I do not want to be too optimistic to say that I think we can get more Federal money, but at least retain what we have. I think I know that support from black and Hispanic groups, they do not even know about this kind of program.

In my district, they have a heck of a time trying to get money just to get computers into the high schools so that they can learn how to live in this society of ours and I want to do all I can as a Congressman. You know, to come all the way out here just to say, "Hello," is not my bag, you know. [Laughter.]

It is true I have a brother here sitting back there. I am glad to get to say, "Hello," to him; but I can do that by phone, you know. But I just want to know what can we do, what can I do as a Congressman to make sure you retain what you do have, the kind of program for the arts that you have gotten and make sure it is not emasculated as some of the other programs are, which are so helpful and so necessary for people in order to exist and live in an era when poverty is on the rise and the wealthy—some of them are getting wealthier and the poor are getting poorer and in a destitute position, as you say in the State of Montana.

Mr. HODSOLL. Well, maybe I could make two comments, if I could, Mr. Hayes, on that. First of all, with regard to programs for minority art forms and then, secondly, the question, of how does one retain monies for the arts endowment.

First on the minority side, as you know, sir, from almost the beginning of the Endowment we established a program which we call Expansion Arts. That program is designed to assist organizations that are deeply rooted in and reflective of a minority, inner city, rural or tribal communities.

The common thread through those four adjectives is "poor." That is what it really comes down to. And, indeed, we were very gratified when this committee, in our reauthorization in 1985, seized on that program as, I believe, I think the Committee thought, a good example of an attempt by a Federal agency to reach out to try and help those who do not have ready access to the more traditional sources of support from the communities or from the private sector or whatever.

The Expansion Arts program at the Endowment has been quite a success. Beyond its own success, it has been the seed bed, interestingly enough, for some of the best ideas that have existed at the Endowment. The Locals Test Program, itself, came out of Expansion Arts. Actually, it began in the City of Chicago with a tripartite collaboration consortium between the Chicago Council of Fine Arts, the Chicago Community Trust and the Endownment to put together a sum of money on a relatively permanent basis to assist just the kinds of emerging organizations that you were speaking of.

Similarly, our Advancement program, which provides monies for technical assistance for these groups and then—just to put it in non-bureaucratic terms—so that they can hire somebody to come in and organize whatever the artists want organized, establish some fund raising, learn how to fill out application forms, make sure

that they are in compliance with health and safety regulations as they operate, all those kinds of things which for larger organizations are sort of automatic, but for smaller organizations, they are often a mystery. The Advancement program has grown as well.

Now, having said all of the above, I would be the first to admit, whether it be in Montana or whether it be in Chicago or whether it be anyplace else that is poor for one reason or another, that there are enormous problems in these communities. They are problems that go much deeper than the arts, of course. They involve the general economy, the demographics, the nature of the infrastructure, the ability to provide jobs, the quality of the schools. All of the things that go into making a community.

I suppose that it is fair to say that at the Federal level that the combination of programs, whether education or arts or health or whatever, that it is the combination of these programs that must work together in these areas.

We are trying to do our part. We can always improve. There is no question about that. It is a priority. We are trying to help in these areas, whether rural or urban, et cetera.

Coming now to the broader question that you raise: I think that in a time of enormous Federal deficits that we have been extremely fortunate in the fact that there has been very broad gauged support in the Congress for our programs, nonpartisan, from Democrats and Republicans. There are some who are against us. But by and large the majority of people are for, generally speaking, what we do. That has resulted in our budget not being significantly cut.

All I can say with respect to that is that it is incumbent upon us, certainly at the Endowment, to continually make the case that the monies that we spend, monies that belong to the taxpayers of this country, when spent on the arts are spent in the national interest. If we can continue to credibly make that case, whether it be for a poor area of Chicago or Montana or a rich area of Colorado or California—I have no idea what I am talking about, now—no matter who it is, whatever it is, we will probably hold our own. I would just say thank you to the committee for its support.

Ms. TALBOT. I certainly agree with what Mr. Hodsoll says. The support of this committee has been tremendously helpful to the arts, not just on the endowment level, but also on the State level. And we are able to do some things which we could not otherwise do. We hope that the committee will continue to have the kind of interest and the kind of support that they have had in the past.

Mr. WILLIAMS. One of the reasons, as you know, Frank and Sue, that despite the deficit and despite what has been some pretty significant cuts in other areas of spending, one of the reasons that the arts has been able to maintain and to some degree increase the amount received from the Federal Government is because Mike Lowry is on the House Budget Committee and when the—[Laughter. Applause.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, you get my point.

Mike?

Mr. LOWRY. Thank you. Actually, it is because Pat Williams has chaired this subcommittee and Sid Yates is on the Appropriations Committee. These are two arts supports in exactly the right place.

Mr. Hodsoll, two questions: One is akin to Ms. Talbot's questions. Specifically, I would like to ask about the $150,000 limit. If I understand the program correctly, we have $150,000 minimum and we have a 2-to-1 match. I just spent my summer vacation a week ago in your beautiful State and I stopped by the Charlie Russell exhibit in Helena. I'm familiar with the economics of the State of Montana. We had to leave the cottage and pull right straight out on 1 day's notice.

I mean I could really feel this question that you are raising about the economic conditions of a community. Should there not be flexibility? Or maybe there is a way to have more flexibility in given conditions like this. It seems like in addition to all the benefits from the arts programs, that almost exactly where there would be some added benefit from the National Endowment for the Arts locals program would be in a place that was going through economically bad conditions caused by things that really were kind of beyond the community's control.

So, is there a way that there could be flexibility relative to the $150,000 floor? And, secondly, we now have the University of Southern Maine study. You have had a chance, obviously, now, to work the program for a few years. What changes, Mr. Hodsoll, would you now make in the program or are there any that you would make?

Mr. HODSOLL. Thank you very much, Mr. Lowry.

Well, first of all, with regard to the matching of funds, the $150,000 minimum. I think a critical point to recognize is that in the more rural areas, grants have primarily gone through the State arts agency, in which the State matches 1-to-1 and then the local communities match 1-to-1. That reduces the amount of match that has to come from any given community. For example, North Dakota is right next door to Montana, just a little bit to the east. They are also a depressed State. Agriculture and coal are the principal parts of the economy there. We gave a locals grant to the State of North Dakota and they then spread that money out throughout the State at the State government level. It is not for me to in any way suggest how Montana should organize, but to the extent there is any equivalence, let me just make the North Dakota example.

Basically, at the State level, even in a small State like North Dakota, which has a population of about half a million—it is about the same population wise as Montana, more or less—$150,000 of additional State money is a very small amount within the whole budget of the State of North Dakota. And for some of the small towns in North Dakota, Colfax comes to mind, which is south of Fargo. I have been there, so, I sort of remember that one, it is a very small farming community. They may get a grant, a combined State/Federal grant of—I do not know what they got, but let us say on the order of $25,000, which they would then have to raise $25,000 to match.

We feel that through that kind of device, that there is flexibility at the local level to give small, manageable amounts to smaller communities. I would certainly agree that a town like Colfax could not possibly raise $300,000.

So, we have developed a mechanism which allows the smaller communities to participate through the State, but maintained the rigidity, if you will, to use the bad term, at the national level in order to force people at the State level to get and to create coalitions of localities as opposed to each locality coming in by itself. We believe that more money will ultimately reach smaller communities as a result.

Let me just say one more thing before I get to how we think we have improved the program. Ms. Talbot was mentioning that the evaluation report mentions substitution. That is fair in the sense that sometimes money that matches our money is taken from Pot X and moved to Pot Y and so on and so forth. I might say that is a problem with our matching grants across the board. It does not just happen in this program. You would have to have 100 accountants on staff to make sure that that never happens at any point.

However, I believe it was also the evaluation's conclusion that while this happens, it is not the majority of what happens. We try to be sufficiently eagle-beagle to make sure that our leverage counts.

At any rate, that is my answer to your question and to Ms. Talbot.

With regard to the improvement of the program, basically, it comes down to this: We have taken some money from the program and put it into a separate set of categories which are available directly to local arts agencies that do not have any professional staff, who have not developed any planning mechanism, who are at such a grass roots level that they have great difficulty getting anything done except on an event-by-event basis. We are hopeful that we will be able to create training programs that will assist with these problems. I believe that this will have an impact particularly in the smaller communities.

The National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies now, which is the service organization for the localities has been particularly helpful in this regard. They are a growing movement and will help us with this.

Finally, I was at the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies meeting a few months ago. I have been going to these meetings now for 4 or 5 years. And, now, I am going to give you a vibration impression for what it is worth.

I found that through going to these meetings that there is a growing sort of grass roots sense that all of these local arts agencies are coming together on behalf of the arts and particularly on behalf of their localities. I am sort of a gray-faced bureaucrat and I do not often use this word, but I think it is truly exciting. It is quite amazing to go to these meetings now and get a sense of the enthusiasm that exists there. What I am saying is something political, with a small "p." I believe at the local level, the force on behalf of the arts is going to become even more irresistible than it already is. And we should support that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. My thanks to both of you. Before you leave, however, and lest there is any misunderstanding among the participants at this hearing, that Montana is an Appalachia like island in the west, let me say——

[Laughter]

I know folks here understand the difficulties that eastern Washington State, northern Idaho, Montana, and the Dakotas and Wyoming share. As I think you probably know, Frank, from your travels out here, those parts of this country are economically dependent on a thing called "price". If the price of timber and copper and gold and silver, wheat, barley and the rest of it is going well and if things are happening at Federal and State levels that encourage rather than discourage the economy, then our States flourish. If not, our states have a tough time of it.

We have come through in this decade, all of us, a rather difficult time, but we think we have come through it intact and we have come through it with improved arts agencies; and that, by itself, is a bit of an achievement. In no small way, Frank, you have been part of the reason that the arts agencies, even in difficult times, have not only maintained themselves, but improved. So, we appreciate your leadership on that. But, as you know, and we know without folks like Ms. Talbot doing their volunteer bit at the State and local levels, that none of it would work.

We appreciate both of you taking time to be here and, of course, invite you to remain for the other witnesses. Thank you very much.

Mr. HODSOLL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, we will ask all the members of the second and final panel to come to the microphones. That is Ms. Kjris Lund, Ms. Judith Meltzer, Mr. Carl Petrick, and Mr. David Skinner.

We are appreciative of each of you agreeing to be with us today. The order in which you are listed in our witness list is not the order in which I will ask for your testimony. If I may, I would like to ask Mr. Skinner to proceed and then Ms. Lund, then Mr. Petrick and, finally, Judith Meltzer.

Mr. Skinner is with the Skinner Corporation here in Seattle and is today representing the American Council for the Arts.

Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF DAVID E. SKINNER, SKINNER CORPORATION, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR THE ARTS

Mr. SKINNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hayes and Mr. Lowry.

I do appreciate the opportunity to address the subcommittee today, but I must begin with a qualification. I do not claim detailed knowledge of the NEA's local arts agency development program. I speak to you primarily as a Seattle businessman, and as a Trustee of the American Council for the Arts and of our local Corporate Council for the Arts. I have and have had for a long time a broad interest in culture and art and the economic benefits that they provide to Washington State and the Puget Sound region and also in organized program which fosters increased public and private sector support for the arts. The latter is central to my comments today. If the program you are addressing at this hearing is instrumental in generating additional dollars on a local level, and I am assured that that is the case, then it deserves my support.

When a word is over-used in any context, it begins to lose its potency, and, to some extent, that has happened to the word "partnership" in discussing the resolution of arts funding problems. An appropriate synonym is elusive, however.

We in the private and public sectors must meld our resources, even though our primary motivations and objectives are not the same. While the National Endowment for the Arts has a mandate to propagate the arts for the benefit of society at large, the private donor is perhaps a bit more selfish, often providing support out of personal love for the art form involved. And the business donor, to the occasional consternation of the pure philanthropist, tends to look for economic benefit at the bottom line.

Together, however, our combined financial support provides the bedrock upon which the arts in this country have built their foundations. It is constructive to challenge one another to greater generosity. The NEA's local arts agency development program poses such a challenge to both urban and rural populations.

The State of Washington, like most Western States, has undergone a rapid growth in its arts industry. Eighty-four percent of our arts organizations did not even exist in 1960. We are the 20th most populous State in the Union, but we boast the 12th largest population of artists. Our Pacific Northwest has some unique patterns in its support for the arts. Compared to other areas, our region has relatively few wealthy established patrons with a long tradition of giving to the arts. Our public and private foundations are relatively new and only beginning to respond substantively to the arts community's need for support.

Seattle/Tacoma business gives about $1.35 million in annual operating support through a united fund campaign and provides more than twice that amount or a total of about $4 million in the form of unevenly applied direct gifts to individual art agencies. Like most other areas of the country, our corporate giving tends to be tied to urban centers.

Access to government support in Washington State has historically and geographically been uneven. Art organizations in Seattle and Tacoma, for example, receive city, county, State and Federal support because they have the agencies to coordinate such assistance. Most other communities in Washington receive only token State and Federal funds.

I am told that this typical pattern on a national level helped prompt the creation of the NEA program that you are examining today.

I know from experience that the arts mean jobs, jobs which benefit the local economy. Seattle arts alone employ 2,300 people and generate $26.3 million in annual wages and salaries.

Economic spin-offs are elusive, but using the most conservative multiplier from the U.S. Department of Commerce, an estimated $34.1 million per year in indirect local economic activity is set in motion by those wages and salaries. Part of that economic benefit is $9.8 million in new money which is attracted into the local economy from outside the region.

The arts attract new businesses to this region. Our cultural assets are a big plus in the eyes of top corporate executives and, all other factors being equal, can be a pivotal factor in corporate loca-

tion decisions. They also aid resident corporations in recruiting and retaining a high-quality labor force, and even promote enhanced productivity among employees.

The arts are good for trade. International trade, which is so important to the economy of our region, goes hand-in-hand with cultural exchange. The arts accelerate the process of developing trade relations and help Washington State take advantage of its location on the Pacific Rim.

The arts serve as a catalyst for neighborhood revitalization. In our neighboring Tacoma, for example, the renovation of the Pantages Theatre has assisted in the redevelopment of a blighted section of the downtown core. The new downtown Seattle Art Museum will perform a similar function for a rundown section of Second Avenue, and aid in connecting the city's waterfront with the retail core.

Our urban areas are benefitting handsomely from the arts and I believe that the National Endowment should be lauded for its initiative in addressing the lack of practical funding mechanisms in non-urban areas. They should be encouraged to continue this program.

I would ask you to urge Congress to continue supporting the NEA in its exploration of creative ways to help unlock community-based resources, both public and private, to enhance the stability and vitality of the arts in our country.

I thank you very much for this opportunity to speak with you today.

[The prepared statement of David E. Skinner follows:]

SKINNER CORPORATION

D. E. Skinner
Testimony before House Subcommittee
on Postsecondary Education
August 25, 1987

I appreciate the opportunity to address the Subcommittee today, but must begin with a qualification. I do not claim detailed knowledge of the N.E.A.'s local arts agency development program. I speak to you primarily as a Seattle businessman, and as a Trustee of both the American Council for the Arts and of our local Corporate Council for the Arts. I have a broad interest in art and culture, in the economic benefits they provide to Washington State and the Puget Sound region, and in any organized program which fosters increased public and private sector support for the arts. The latter is central to my comments today. If the program you are addressing at this hearing is instrumental in generating additional dollars on a local level, and I am assured that that is the case, then it deserves my support.

When a word is over-used in any context, it begins to lose its potency, and to some extent that has happened to the word "partnership" in discussing the resolution of arts funding problems. An appropriate synonym is elusive, however. We in the private and public sectors must meld our resources, even though our primary motivations and objectives are not the same. While the National Endowment for the Arts has a mandate to propagate the arts for the benefit of society at large, the private donor is perhaps a bit more selfish -- often providing support out of personal love for the art form involved. And the business donor, to the occasional consternation of the pure philanthropist, tends to look for economic benefit at the bottom line. Together, however, our combined financial support provides the bedrock on which the arts in this country have built their foundations. It is constructive to challenge one another to greater generosity. The N.E.A.'s local arts agency development program poses such a challenge to both urban and rural populations.

Washington, like most Western states, has undergone a rapid growth in its arts industry. Eighty-four percent of our arts organizations did not exist in 1960. We are the 20th most populous state in the union, but can boast the 12th largest population of artists. Our Pacific Northwest has some unique patterns in its support for the arts. Compared to other areas, our region has relatively few wealthy, established patrons with a long tradition of giving to the arts. Our public and private foundations are relatively new and only beginning to respond substantively to the arts community's need for support. Seattle/Tacoma business gives about $1.35 million in annual operating support through a united fund campaign, and provides more than twice that amount in the form of unevenly applied direct gifts to individual art agencies. Like most other areas of the country, our corporate giving tends to be tied to urban centers.

Access to government support in Washington state has, historically and geographically, been uneven. Art organizations in Seattle and Tacoma,

for example, receive city, county, state and federal support because they have the agencies to coordinate such assistance. Most other communities in Washington receive only token state and federal funds. I am told that this typical pattern, on a national level, helped prompt the creation of the N.E.A. program you are examining today.

I know from experience that the arts mean jobs -- jobs which benefit the local economy. Seattle arts alone employ 2300 people and generate $26.3 million in annual wages and salaries. Economic spin-offs are elusive, but using the most conservative multiplier from the U. S. Department of Commerce, an estimated $34.1 million per year in indirect local economic activity is set in motion by those wages and salaries. Part of that economic benefit is $9.2 and $9.8 million in new money which is attracted into the local economy from outside this region.

The arts attract new businesses to this region. Our cultural assets are a big plus in the eyes of top corporate executives and, all other factors being equal, can be a pivotal factor in corporate location decisions. They also aid resident corporations in recruiting and retaining a high-quality labor force, and even promote enhanced productivity among employees.

The arts are good for trade. International trade -- so important to the economy of our region -- goes hand in hand with cultural exchange. The arts accelerate the process of developing trade relations and help Washington State take advantage of its location on the Pacific Rim.

The arts serve as a catalyst for neighborhood revitalization. In our neighboring Tacoma, for example, the renovation of the Pantages Theatre has assisted in the redevelopment of a blighted section of the downtown core. The new downtown Seattle Art Museum will perform a similar function for a rundown section of Second Avenue, and aid in connecting the city's waterfront with the retail core.

Our urban areas are benefitting handsomely from the arts, and I believe that the National Endowment should be lauded for its initiative in addressing the lack of practical funding mechanisms in non-urban areas. They should be encouraged to continue this program.

I would ask you to urge Congress to continue supporting the N.E.A. in its exploration of creative ways to help unlock community-based resources, both public and private, to enhance the stability and vitality of the arts in our country.

Thank you very much for this opportunity to speak with you today.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Mr. Skinner.

Ms. Kjris Lund is the Director of the King County Arts Commission and we are delighted you are with us today. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF KJRIS LUND, DIRECTOR, KING COUNTY ARTS COMMISSION

Ms. LUND. Chairman Williams, Congressman Hayes, Congressman Lowry, thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning.

For the record, my name is Kjris Lund. I am the Director of the King County Arts Commission and also manage the Cultural Resources Division of King County which includes our historic preservation program and our museum programs.

What I will speak to today is how the King County Arts Commission is working with local communities in seeking ways to expand audiences county-wide through outreach in education as part of Performa '87, a festival of new works. Performa is a program made possible by a grant from the Local Test Program of the NEA.

The NEA stepped in at a critical juncture when the Performa Program was faltering and provided guidance and support to make it happen. And it is happening this fall.

Before I begin my testimony, I would like to speak to the qualities that distinguish the King County Arts Commission from the Seattle Arts Commission. The ambiguity between the City of Seattle and an urban county such as King County is one that I think I should clarify so that you can understand it.

First of all, King County is over 2,200 square miles in size. It extends from Puget Sound to the Cascade Mountains. It includes several islands. It includes federally designated wilderness areas. It includes 28 cities, among them, the City of Seattle. Our population totals 1.3 million people.

The majority of our arts organizations are based in the City of Seattle. The audiences, however, come from throughout King County. A recent study has shown that of the top 15 major organizations, arts organizations in the city, 50 percent of their season ticket holders come from outside the city from King County. Throughout the county, in the 28 or the 27 suburban cities and the unincorporated communities, we have a network of local art councils. Some of them are within suburban cities, such as Auburn, which has a population of 30,000 people, or Redmond with a population of 40,000. And others of these councils are located in communities such as Vashon Island with a population of 7,000 and an unincorporated section of King County of 75,000 people known as Federal Way.

The King County Arts Commission's mission is to provide access to all county residents to high-quality arts experiences. This includes residents of the city, residents of the unincorporated areas, suburban cities, special population groups and our ethnic minorities. This is a challenge.

We are excited about the ways that Performa '87 has given an opportunity to meet this challenge. The National Endowment for the Arts provided us with $150,000 over a 3-year period which has been matched by $300,000 of King County tax revenue and has been matched more than 6.5 times over that investment by the pri-

vate community and by arts organizations and individuals. The total investment, as I checked all the budgets for the projects before this hearing, is well over $1 million.

Twenty-one new works will be premiering this fall in music, dance, theater and performance art. My written testimony speaks to the importance of Performa in increasing opportunities for generative artists and emerging artists in opportunities to collaborate with artists from the local community, nationally and internationally, and to collaborate with artists across disciplines.

My written testimony also speaks to the importance of the NEA in helping us to fund the creative process. It is the creative process that underlies our educational and outreach program. There are three components to Performa's education and outreach program, the program that will reach audiences outside the City of Seattle, special population groups and ethnic minorities. We are holding 12 artists' workshops and demonstrations in public schools countywide. We are holding two creativity workshops in community colleges. And, as part of our contract with all grantees who receive Performa funding, we have required that a public access event be scheduled that is free to the public. This includes open rehearsals, lectures, demonstrations.

The success of the education outreach program, however, depends on assistance from local arts organizations. This assistance is necessary in order to locate facilities outside the city where performances can happen and in order to get an audience to attend those events.

A second element of success comes from the adaptability of the artist, the art form and the content to rural and suburban audiences.

I would like to cite two examples from Performa that demonstrate how these—the coordination with local arts councils and the adaptability of the artist becomes important. First of all, I would like to mention Pat Grainey. She is an NEA Fellow and she was an artist from King County who was invited to participate in the Statue of Liberty Festival in New York last summer. She is producing a piece called "Seven Uneven." It is a gymnastics piece that incorporates dance and sports and it will happen in King County at Mary Moore Park, which is a major park in the rural section, now suburbanizing section, of King County. It is a collaboration between a visual artist and a choreographer.

The wonderful thing about Pat's work is that it is available to people. They are holding open rehearsals out in a park setting. There are no boundaries, there are no fees to come in and see the rehearsals. Children, families, dogs, dog owners are coming in to watch them perform and to practice.

In addition to the open rehearsals and then a schedule of performances that will occur this fall, Pat is also holding workshops that will teach people about the relationship between athletics and dance. Some of these workshops are happening in communities like Black Diamond. Black Diamond is a coal mining community in the southern part of King County.

A second example from Performa that illustrates how working with local arts councils and the community can be effective is the work of Julian Priester. Julian Priester is a jazz trombonist. He

has played with Duke Ellington, Ray Charles, and Lionel Hampton. He is going to be performing in Auburn. Auburn is a city south of Seattle with a population of about 30,000, where there is an active arts commission which was developed with a lot of assistance from King County and from the State of Washington.

The Auburn Arts Commission is helping to produce this event. And Julian Priester will also be holding a workshop on Vashon Island where there—although it is an unincorporated community, there is a local arts council known as Vashon Allied Arts.

These are two examples that I think are important to demonstrate how Performa is working with the NEA Local Test Program.

What is next for King County? Following Performa, what we will be looking at is cultural planning with our suburban and rural communities. We are looking at ways to integrate arts in the community planning process, ways to integrate the arts into decisions that are made about land use and infrastructure and services.

We are working with local arts agencies in order to get them to be a vital part of that process. Every other month, we have initiated meetings with all of the suburban and local arts councils to get the dialogue going between King County and those communities.

One of the things that has become evident in those discussions is the reliance of those communities on the major institutions and the professional artists who are based in the City of Seattle. My initial thought was that they would want to develop on their own without necessarily relying on those urban-based institutions, but, in fact, it is the quality and the high standards and the reputation of those arts organizations doing performances out in the county that help to develop audiences throughout King County. They help to develop the community arts organizations.

In the future, the kind of assistance that I would like to see on behalf of the County Arts Commission, coming from the Federal Government and from Congress is a continuation of the incentive approach to Federal funding the idea of continuing programs that develop audiences and arts awareness. The beginning of attitudes and opinions about the arts happen through education. Supportive touring and access are important goals of the King County Arts Commission that are costly.

Finally, with the other hat that I wear in my job of historic preservation, I am aware of a program that may be effective in regard to arts funding known as the Certified Local Government Program. It is a program that Congress supported through amendments to the National Historic Preservation Act that recognizes the development of Arts Commissions such as the County Arts Commission and the Seattle Arts Commission by providing different mechanisms for funding so that we can avoid duplication of services with the State, that we can deal with the issue of professional qualifications that was discussed earlier and that we can find more efficient ways to fund local programs.

I would like to thank you for your support and your interest in the arts.

[The prepared statement of Kjristine R. Lund follows:]

August 25, 1987

Testimony by Kjristine R. Lund
House Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
National Endowment for the Arts: Test Program of Support for Local Arts Agencies

INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman, committee members, my name is Kjristine Lund. I currently hold the position of Executive Director of the King County Arts Commission (KCAC) and am also Manager of King County's Cultural Resources Division. On behalf of King County Executive Tim Hill and the KCAC, I welcome you to King County. King County in Washington is larger in square miles than the States of Rhode Island and Connecticut combined. The County extends from Puget Sound to the Cascade Mountains and includes several islands, federally designated wilderness areas and 28 cities including the City of Seattle. Our population totals 1.3 million. I applaud your efforts to gather testimony from the Northwest section of our country.

The main point I want to stress is that in the early stages of Performa 87, our innovative arts program, the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) stepped in to provide financial support and guidance at a critical juncture when the program was faltering. The NEA support served as a catalyst to the local arts community who responded both artistically and financially.

The KCAC celebrates its 20th Anniversary this year, one year following the 20th Anniversary of the NEA. This year also marks the 200th Anniversary of the U.S. Constitution (I should note King County artist Selma Thomas was selected by the Smithsonian Institute to produce their video installation for the bi-centennial of the constitution exhibit.) making today an especially appropriate time to reaffirm the importance of freedom of expression in government funded arts programs and to evaluate the success of our federal grant system in regard to the arts.

PERFORMA '87: A FESTIVAL OF NEW WORKS

In celebration of its 20th Anniversary the KCAC is producing a festival of new works in the performing arts named Performa '87. The NEA's Local Test Program provided $150,000 over a three-year period, beginning in 1986, to support the creation of 21 new works in theater, dance, music, and performance art. Performa '87 has been controversial since its inception because it is a festival of risk. Risk is inherent in trying something new. The innovation in Performa is in the art itself, it is in a newly forged relationship between government and artists, and it is in the involvement of artist with the community through public education and performances in nontraditional venues.

Four themes are at the heart of Performa '87. These are themes that illustrate the significance and the contribution of NEA funding for this festival:

- The role of government in the arts
- The spirit of collaboration
- The cultural ecology of our community
- The creative process

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN THE ARTS

It is imperative that government create and sustain a climate that allows for freedom of expression. A partnership of funding between the federal and local level of government allows art to happen. During the uncertain days of Performa's future, the presence of support by the NEA bolstered the courage of local leaders to commit their support for new work and the individual artists creating that work.

In addition to allowing freedom of expression, the signifiance of government involvement in Performa '87 is evident in at least three other ways:

- Leveraging dollars
- Expanding audiences
- Educating the public about new work

Leveraging Dollars

The federal government's $150,000 investment in Performa '87 led to a commitment of $300,000 from King County government toward the festival. In addition, the State and Seattle Arts Commissions also provided funds to support specific participating artists and organizations. In total, $984,000 in matching dollars and services have been leveraged by the NEA's contribution, that is more than a 6.5 times increase in investment.

Expanding Audiences

The KCAC in response to priorities of the NEA and local officials developed a marketing plan to reach new audiences within Seattle and throughout King County. Ticketmaster, a private corporation, is marketing and selling tickets to the new works festival. In addition, King County is working with a network of arts organizations in Seattle and Countywide to further awareness in specific communities about Performa '87.

Seven/Uneven is a performance art piece commissioned for Performa '87 that will be performed in a major park in rural King County. The piece is a collaboration between choreographer Pat Graney and visual artist Beliz Brother and will use the physical power and coordination of seven gymnasts in an hour-long choreographed performance on an installation of gymnastic equipment. New audiences in rural King County will have the opportunity to appreciate art through sports. Many of the 21 premiere works in Performa 87 will be brought to suburban audiences.

Education

As part of all contracts written between King County and Performa '87 artists, a public outreach event is required. Two creativity conferences are scheduled at community colleges in suburban King County involving artists and the general public. In addition, an in-school study guide and workshop series are being offered in secondary schools countywide in collaboration with the State Superintendent of Education.

COLLABORATION

Artistic excellence is the standard for Performa '87. Art has no boundaries and thus collaboration between King County artists and artists from California, New York, the Midwest, Europe, Asia, and Africa is an important part of the festival.

While collaboration between artists from various geographic locales is made possible by NEA funding so is collaboration between artists of different disciplines. New York visual theater artist Ping Chong and Seattle musician and composer Norman Durkee will collaborate on Without Law, Without Heaven, an opera about the Chinese Cultural Revolution and the 1980 trial of the Gang of Four.

National media attention is already occurring in coverage of these precedent setting works and collaborations. It is our hope that the newly forged relationships created by Performa '87 will lead to further opportunities for Performa artists.

CULTURAL ECOLOGY

The national peer panel that chose the 21 projects for Performa '87 chose a roster of participants that represents the ecology of our cultural community. Participants include major institutions like the Seattle Symphony and the Seattle Repertory Theater; mid-sized institutions like the Empty Space Theater and the New City Theater; individual artists like Julian Priester and Patti Dobrowolski and ethnically diverse organizations and individuals.

CREATIVE PROCESS

Time art critic Robert Hughes recently wrote in the New York Review of Books (August 13, 1987) about painter Lucian Freud. He quotes Freud:

> "A moment of complete happiness never occurs in the creation of a work of art. The promise of it is felt in the art of creation but disappears toward the completion of the work ... Until then he had almost dared to hope that (it) might spring to life. It is this great insufficiency that drives him on. Thus the process of creation becomes necessary perhaps more than the (result)."

It is this promise and this process of creation that Performa '87 provides for artist and audience.

SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS

I encourage the NEA to continue to approach funding opportunities between the federal government and local arts agencies with an incentive method as represented by Performa '87. In the future Congress might look toward establishing a category for local arts agencies similar to that established for local governments under the National Historic Preservation Act as amended--The Certified Local Government (CLG).

The CLG program recognizes the quality, integrity and capability of local governments which have adopted certain cultural programs and guidelines. The law allows for more "local control" and access to certain federal funds channelled through states. Such a plan would enhance the development of local arts agencies and would avoid duplication between state and local government.

The NEA Local Test Grant that made Performa '87 possible has thus far surpassed its expected value in King County. The NEA paperwork, administrative requirements and reimbursement procedures are less cumbersome than those of other federal agencies with whom I have worked.

Performa '87 is evidence of successful cooperation between the federal government, local government and the local arts community.

KRL:ol
2.K.28

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Carl Petrick is the Director of the Seattle Arts Commission. Please proceed.

STATEMENT OF CARL PETRICK, DIRECTOR, SEATTLE ARTS COMMISSION

Mr. PETRICK. Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, on behalf of our Mayor, Charles Royer, I would like to invite you to a very special place for the arts and welcome you here to the City of Seattle.

We are fortunate to have some 75 arts organizations in this City, employing over 2,800 artists. The combined budgets of these organizations are over $30 million, and last year these organizations presented 2,500 performances or exhibits, attended by 1.6 million people. Also contributing to the vitality of Seattle are some 3,600 painters, sculptors, composers and poets.

Per capita funding for the arts in the city is $4 and, recently, the citizens of Seattle passed a $30 million levy to build a new art museum in partnership with the private sector.

We have a public art program that is a model for other cities throughout the world, and no city can rival us yet in the productions of Wagner or in the vitality of our regional theatre scene. Currently, our County is launching Performa, an exciting festival of new works, while at the same time the people of this region are rising to the challenge of stabilizing our major cultural institutions.

We recognize the value of the arts and support them at the local level. We also gratefully acknowledge the support of the Federal Government, for you have joined us in these endeavors over the years from funds from the National Endowment for the Arts.

The Seattle Arts Commission is completing its third and final year as a recipient of a Local Arts Agency Program grant. This multi-year grant of $375,000 was matched by the City of Seattle, providing $1.2 million of new government funds for the arts. These funds were in turn matched by the private sector yielding a grand total of $2.4 million.

These new resources were used by the Arts Commission to address specific needs as they became evident through our public planning process. Increased funding for our arts organizations, new programs for the Traditional Arts and individual artists, a Public Art Space and a new pilot Arts in Education Program; all of these initiatives were made possible by the funds from the Locals Program.

The current administrative requirements of the program work very well to ensure the development of the local arts agencies because they require the agency to engage in a 3-year public planning process. Ultimately, it is this local plan of needs, priorities and resource allocation that the Endowment panel reviews. This procedure is perhaps the greatest strength of the Locals' Program, as it recognizes through a true partnership the legitimacy of self-determination at the local level. Other components of the Program that are beneficial to the local arts agency are the requirements for a structured public process and multi-year significant funding and

the two-to-one match provided in new public dollars. The criteria also allow for smaller, often rural, agencies to form a consortium with their States and approach the Endowment for funds.

The success of this program in Seattle cannot be measured solely by the many accomplishments during the 3-year term of the grant. True impact can only be measured by examining future directions after the grant period. It is in this area that I am pleased to announce today major success.

The Mayor of Seattle will be recommending to our City Council this fall that our pilot Arts in Education Program, initially funded by the Locals' grant, become a permanent program in the City with new funding of $150,000. This program will provide thousands of Seattle school children the opportunity to work with artists in making the arts an integral part of their education.

The Endowment's Local Arts Agency Program has been a success for Seattle. It has generated new public interest in the arts, validated our commitment at the local level and encouraged us to go beyond.

As a Board member of the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies, I have had the opportunity to hear other such success stories from throughout the country. Local governments have and will continue to respond well to the leadership provided by the Federal Government in this partnership.

As such, I would urge that you, members of the committee, maintain your commitment to local arts agencies throughout this country by continued and increased support for this very important program. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Carl J. Petrick follows:]

Seattle Arts Commission

305 HARRISON, SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98109 (206) 625-4223 / CARL J. PETRICK, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY / CITY OF SEATTLE, CHARLES ROYER, MAYOR

COMMISSIONERS
Eve Green
Chair
George Suzuma
Vice-Chair
Joseph Bartscherer
Marcella Bendott
Paul Brown
Cynthia Hartwig
Lucy Aldrich Homans
Michael J. Levin
Ben Moore
Sheila Mullen
Richard Posner
Dorothy L. Simpson
Joy Wood
Yvonne Yarbro-Bejarano
Arlee Young Wilson

FORMER COMMISSIONERS
Ed J. Albadell
Ellsworth C. Alvord, Jr.
Julie Anderson
Claudio Arenas
Alfredo Arreguin
Wayne Barclay
Russel Barsh
Mrs. Frederic J. Blanchet
Joan Ross Blondel
Richard Blresang
Mrs. John Bowen
Bob Camuso
Dr. Stanley Chapple
Irving M. Clark, Jr.
Michele D. Cloe
Tom Dunn
Anne Focke
Donald J. Foster
Anne Gerber
Mes Harrison
Anne Gould Hauberg
Norm Hoagy
Donald Horowitz
Sibyl James
Solomon Katz
Hattie Kauffman
Andrew Keating
Martha Kingsbury
Christopher Kirk
H. Dewayne Kreager
Mark Lewis
Peter LeSourd
Sherry Markovitz
John A. Mega
Joyce Mary
Elsley B. Nordstrom
A. Daniel O'Neal
Robert Ohashi
Tommer Peterson
Alberto Ralola
Ann Sheffer Reich
Lawren Reyes
Lorne Richards
Jerome Sandard
Mrs. K.A. Sanwick, Jr.
Nimre Sato
Paul E.S. Schell
Linda Sproul
Floyd Standifer, Jr.
Helen Smiers
Samuel N. Stroum
Barbara Swift
Virginia Wallick
Carol R. Washington
Judith A. Wentzel
Bernie Whitebear
Shawn Wong
Mrs. Bagley Wright
Howard S. Wright

Testimony
for
Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
by
Carl J. Petrick
Executive Secretary
Seattle Arts Commission

April 25, 1987
Seattle, Washington

Honorable Chair and Members of the Committee:

I'd like to welcome you now to the "other" Washington -- the State of the Arts; and on behalf of our Mayor, Charles Royer, I'd like to welcome you to a very special place for the arts, the City of Seattle.

We are fortunate to have some 75 arts organizations in the City, employing over 2,800 artists. The combined budgets of these organizations are over $30 million, and last year these organizations presented 2,500 performances or exhibits, attended by 1.6 million people. Also contributing to the vitality of Seattle are some 3,600 painters, sculptors, composers and poets.

(1)

Per capita funding for the arts in the City is $4, and recently the citizens of Seattle passed a $30 million levy to build a new Art Museum in partnership with the private sector.

We have a public art program that is a model for other cities throughout the world, and no city can rival us yet in the productions of Wagner or in the vitality of our regional theatre scene. Currently our County is launching Performa, an exciting festival of new works, while at the same time the people of this region are rising to the challenge of stabilizing our major cultural institutions.

We recognize the value of the arts and support them here at the local level. We also gratefully acknowledge the support of the Federal Government, for you have joined us in these endeavors over the years with funds from the National Endowment for the Arts.

The Seattle Arts Commission is completing its third and final year as a recipient of a Local Arts Agency Program grant from the Endowment. This multi-year grant of $375,000 was matched by the City of Seattle, providing $1.2 million of new government funds for the arts. These funds were in turn matched by the private sector yielding a grand total of $2.4 million.

These new resources were used by the Arts Commission to address specific needs as they became evident through our public planning process. Increased funding for our arts organizations, new programs for the Traditional Arts and individual artists, a Public Art Space to exhibit the collections of the State, County and City, and a new pilot Arts in Education Program; all of these initiatives were made possible by the funds from the Locals Program.

The current administrative requirements of the program work very well to ensure the development of local arts agencies because they require the local agency to engage in a three year public planning process. Ultimately it is this local plan of needs, priorities and resource allocation that the Endowment panel reviews. This procedure is perhaps the greatest strength of the Local's Program as it recognizes, through a true partnership, the legitamacy of self-determination at the local level. Other components of the Program that are beneficial to the local arts agency are: the requirements for a structured public process, multi-year significant funding and the two-to-one match provided in new public dollars. The criteria also allow for smaller, often rural, arts agencies to form a consortium with their states and approach the Endowment for funds.

The success of this program in Seattle cannot be measured solely by the many accomplishments during the three year term of the grant. True impact can only be measured by examining future directions after the grant period. It is in this area that I am pleased to announce today major success.

The Mayor of Seattle will be recommending to our City Council this fall that our pilot Arts in Education Program, initially funded by the Local's grant, become a permanent program in the City with new funding of $150,000. This program will provide thousands of Seattle school children the opportunity to work with artists in making the arts an integral part of their education.

The Endowment's Local Arts Agency Program has been a success for Seattle. It has generated new public interest in the arts, validated our commitment at the local level, and encouraged us to go beyond.

As a Board member of the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies, I have had the opportunity to hear other such success stories from throughout the country as a result of this important program. Local governments have and will continue to respond well to the leadership provided by the Federal Government in this partnership.

As such, I would urge that you, members of the Committee, maintain your commitment to local arts agencies throughout this country by continued and increased support for this important program.

cc: Charles Royer, Mayor of Seattle
Members of the Seattle City Council
Frank Hodsell, Chairman, NEA
Members of the Seattle Arts Commission
Robert Lynch, Executive Director, NALAA

(1) "Economic Impact of Arts Organizations in Seattle"
Seattle Arts Commission, 1986

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Ms. Judith Meltzer is the Director of the Arts in Education Program for the Seattle schools and we are eager to hear from you, today.

STATEMENT OF JUDITH MELTZER, ARTS RESOURCE SPECIALIST, SEATTLE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Ms. MELTZER. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Judith Meltzer and I am very happy to have the opportunity to give testimony regarding this very important issue.

As the Arts Resource Specialist for Seattle Schools, I have been involved with the Seattle Arts Commission from the beginning of this program. Before I respond to your questions, I would like to offer you a brief overview of our schools.

The Seattle School District, the largest in this State, had a very culturally diverse, urban population of approximately 44,000 students, K–12, currently involved in the desegregation process. This striving for a quality integrated education for all students leads to the discovery of many programs that may help lead to the achievement of this goal. The Seattle Arts Commission Arts in Education Program creates these opportunities for students from different cultural backgrounds to work with professional artists to better understand and appreciate each other.

I believe that quality education includes the arts as part of basic education for all students. Achieving this includes the effective use of our rich arts community in our schools and provides ways for quality educational programs to develop through creative collaborations between teachers and artists.

The Seattle School District has explored many types of programs using artists and arts organizations. From this experience, I have learned that the success of these programs is based on the collaborative efforts between artists, arts organizations and schools. This professional partnership between artists and educators is the essence of the Seattle Arts Commission's Arts in Education Program.

You have asked me to respond to the effectiveness of the National Endowment for Arts and local arts agencies in stimulating development within the community. I believe this can best be seen by the administrative requirements that the National Endowment has for our local arts agency. These requirements have allowed all of us to pursue our mutual objectives.

This program has allowed Seattle School District to use community arts resources, artists, and arts organizations more effectively than ever before in our city's classrooms. It also has allowed schools to offer an expanded arts experience to students and staff.

As a direct result of the effectiveness of this program, teachers have demonstrated an appreciation for the arts and a greater ability to integrate the arts into other areas of curriculum, students have acquired a greater exposure and appreciation of the arts, there has been an appreciable increase in the interaction between local artists, arts organizations and our schools; and, of course, other members of our community, such as senior centers, libraries and community centers have become involved with our schools through arts projects.

As we now begin the third year of this innovative program, we can mark the significance and impact it is making on our community. This program directly involves approximately 78 artists, 49 arts organizations, 153 schools and programs, 600 teachers, 13,000 students along with the thousands of parents that have been involved. This is strong evidence of the broad support and interest that this program generates in our community.

In regard to your question as to what role local arts agencies have in promoting the arts through education, I hope to offer a clear picture of the structure and design of the program and how the leadership of the Seattle Arts Commission is vital in securing a successful program.

The Seattle Arts Commission is charged with developing awareness and interest in the arts. Therefore, by creating an arts in education program, it expands its influence to impact schools. In close collaboration with the school district the Seattle Arts Commission designed a two-part arts in education program. One part challenges arts organizations to create programs for schools, requiring planning with the schools that would be the recipient of the service. The other part offers teachers the opportunity to identify artists that would work with them and together collaborate to form projects that worked best in school and support learning in other areas of the curriculum. All projects are encouraged to include multi-cultural context.

In the first year of the program, the world situation urgently created a need for Seattle schools to update its information on apartheid as part of the social studies curriculum. Our local theater company, The Group Theatre, had recently completed a successful run of Sizwie Banzi is Dead by Athol Fugard, a play about apartheid. The Seattle Arts and Education opportunity inspired The Group Theatre to adapt the script for high school audiences and with teacher input, a winning project resulted that included a performance, pre- and post-workshops for students that included the meaning and message of the play and a teacher workshop. This achieved an exceptional learning experience for all concerned. This is only one example of many, many programs that this program has generated.

Finally, you ask me, what effect, if any, will stimulation of local arts agencies likely have on life in the local community?

It is my belief that stimulation will only increase the quality of life in our schools and, therefore, in our total community. By building on the experiences learned during the 3 years, together we will continue to develop and strengthen the Seattle Arts Commission Arts in Education Program. Your support and encouragement is vital.

I often reflect on the great value that the arts contribute to the world. And as the acclaimed musician, Pablo Casals said, "What do we teach our children in school? We teach them that two and two is four and that Paris is the Capital of France. When will we teach them what they are? We should say to each one of them, 'You are a marvel. You are unique. You have the capacity for anything.'"

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Judith Meltzer follows:]

Testimony
for
Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
by

Judith Meltzer

Arts Resource Specialist
Seattle Public Schools

August 25, 1987

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I am Judith Meltzer and I am happy to have the opportunity to give testimony regarding this important issue. As the Arts Resource Specialist for Seattle Schools, I have been involved with the Seattle Arts Commission from the beginning of this program. Before I respond to your questions, I would like to offer you a brief overview of our Schools.

The Seattle School District, the largest in this State, has a very culturally diverse, urban population of approximately forty-four thousand students, K-12, currently in a desegragation process. This striving for a quality integrated education for all students leads to the discovery of many programs that may help lead to the achievement of this goal. The Seattle Arts Commission Arts in Education Program creates these opportunities for students from different cultural backgrounds to work with professional artists to better understand and appreciate each other.

I believe that quality education includes the arts as part of the basic education for all students. Achieving this includes the effective use of our rich arts community in our schools, and provides ways for quality educational programs to develop through creative collaborations between teachers and artists.

The Seattle School District has explored many types of programs using artists and arts organizations. From this experience I have learned that the success of these programs is based on the collaborative efforts between artists and arts organizations and schools. This professional partnership between artists and educators is the essence of the Seattle Arts Commission Arts in Education Program.

You have asked me to respond to the effectiveness of the National Endowments Program for arts and education and local arts agencies in stimulating development within the community.

I believe this can best be seen by the administrative requirements that the National Endowment has for our local arts agency - The Seattle Arts Commission. These requirements have allowed all of us to persue our mutual objectives.

This Program has allowed Seattle School District to use community arts resources, artists, and arts organizations more effectively than ever before in our city's classrooms. It also has allowed the schools

to offer new and expanded arts experiences to students and staff. As a direct result of the effectiveness of this program; 1.) teachers have demonstrated an appreciation for the arts and a greater ability to integrate the arts into other areas of the curriculum, 2.) students have acquired a greater exposure and appreciation of the arts, 3.)there has been an appreciable increase in the interaction between local artists, arts organizations and our schools, and 4.) other members of our community such as senior centers (intergenerational projects), libraries and community centers have become involved with our schools through arts projects.

As we now begin the third year of this innovative program, we can mark the significance and impact it is making on our community. This program directly involves approximately seventy-eight artists, forty-nine arts organizations (fifty-five percent of the total percentage of arts organizations), one hundred and fifty-three schools and programs, six hundred teachers, and thirteen-thousand students along with the thousands of parents who have been involved. This is strong evidence of the broad support and interest this program generates in our community.

In regard to your question as to what role local arts agencies have in promoting the arts through education, I hope to offer a clear picture of the structure and design of the program, and how the leadership of the Seattle Arts Commission is vital in securing a successful program.

The Seattle Arts Commission is charged with developing awareness and interest in the arts. Therefore, by creating an Arts and Education Program, it expands its' influence to impact schools.

In close collaboration with the School District, The Seattle Arts Commission designed a two part Arts and Education Program. One part challenges arts organizations to create programs for schools requiring planning with the schools that would be the recipient of the service. The other part offers teachers the opportunity to identify artists they would work with and together collaborate to form projects that work best in schools and support learning in other areas of the curriculum. All projects are encouraged to include multi-cultural context.

In the first year of the program, the world situation urgently created a need for Seattle Schools to update its' information on apartheid as part of the social studies curriculum. Our local Group Theatre Company had recently completed a successful run of Sizwie Banzi Is Dead, by Athod Fugard, a play about apartheid. The Seattle Arts and Education

opportunity inspired The Group Theatre to adapt the script for high school audiences. With teacher input, a winning project resulted that included a performance, pre and post workshops for students on the meaning and message of the play, and a teacher workshop. This achieved an exceptional learning experience for all concerned.

Finally you ask me, "What effect, if any, will stimulation of local arts agencies likely have on life in the local community?" It is my belief that stimulation will only increase the quality of life in our schools and therefore in our total community. By building on the experiences learned during the three years, together we will continue to develop and strengtnen the Seattle Arts Commission Arts in Education Program. Your support and encouragement is vital.

I often reflect on the great value the arts contribute to the world. As the acclaimed musician Pablo Casals said, "....and what do we teach our children in school? We teach them that two and two is four and that Paris is the Capitol of France. When will we teach them what they are? We should say to each of them, You are a marvel, You are unique, You have the capacity for anything."

cc: William Kendrick, Superintendent, Seattle Public Schools
Douglas Danner, Seattle Public Schools
Charles Royer, Mayor of Seattle
Members of the Seattle City Council
Frank Hodsell, Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts
Carl J. Petrick, Executive Secretary, Seattle Arts Commission

Mr. WILLIAMS. Our thanks to each of you.

Mr. Hayes?

Mr. HAYES. Just a couple of questions. One, I would direct towards Mr. Skinner. How can we increase, if you have any idea, business support for the arts program?

Mr. SKINNER. If I knew the answer to that, Mr. Hayes, I would be doing things a lot differently than I have. I really have been spending my spare time in trying to encourage the private sector generally and the corporate community, specifically, to support all forms of culture, education and health and welfare causes. I am one of those who feel that the private sector has the first responsibility to support, let's say, culture in this instance. And, if it did, there wouldn't be a need for the public sector, at least at the Federal Government level to do so in areas, metropolitan areas, where the private sector would have that kind of clout.

I really think the Federal Government has a priority in the rural areas. And to the extent that the public sector needs to support the metropolitan cities, I think that is a responsibility—that responsibility should come from the state and the county and the cities.

Mr. HAYES. And my second question is probably directed to all of you. Do you see any need for any changing of the two-to-one mix that is now currently enforced? You have heard testimony in the previous panel indicating that they find it hard to meet that kind of ratio.

Mr. PETRICK. Mr. Hayes, I think that the endowment program allows for smaller communities through consortium to have a less of a challenge and a challenge that is reasonable to them. At least, that has been my experience of what I have heard from a number of communities around the country. I would encourage the two-to-one match as it is great leverage. It gives the local arts advocates the opportunity to really strive for significant funding that we need so desperately in these areas.

Ms. LUND. I would also like to speak to that issue. I think the two-to-one match brings some accountability back to the local level about the program, itself. One of the things that I see with different Federal grant programs is one that is not matched oftentimes does not go through the same process of local review and local involvement by the elected officials. Performa, for example, is a great example of how that local review finally shaped a program that became effective.

Mr. HAYES. Ms. Meltzer.

Ms. MELTZER. Yes. I certainly would agree that the accountability of the local level when they have to contribute and put their own resources into these programs helps us in the schools enormously and I would like to see that continue.

Mr. HAYES. Do you share this opinion, Mr. Skinner.

Mr. SKINNER. Yes.

Mr. HAYES. I just want to make one final comment. I was really uplifted when I heard Ms. Meltzer mention that in her state you created a need—the world situation that created a need for Seattle schools to update its information on apartheid as a part of the social studies curriculum. I do not know how many other school systems recognize the need for this kind of update. I just want to commend you for the advance thinking on the part of the Seattle

school system and I know you must have played a role in that. I guess you had the blessing of the political leaders in the City of Seattle. Is that right?

Ms. MELTZER. That is correct. And when you learn about issues like that, Mr. Hayes, when you learn and try to create opportunities for students to learn about issues like apartheid, opportunities like the arts give kids an opportunity, as well as teachers, to learn this material through enormously creative ways as was done through this project.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Lowry.

Mr. LOWRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you all for your excellent testimony and what you do in your individual commitments for the arts.

With this new Locals Programs, a program came in a few years ago, how has that worked as far as working with the State programs and, you know, we often in government experience turfism. I mean we often—not only in government, right, Mr. Skinner? We often experience turfism in large organizations. And, so, how does it fit together? Is there a feeling that this is taking away from State programs? Generally, how is it working from that standpoint?

Mr. PETRICK. I will comment, first. One of the components, Mr. Lowry, of our locals grant was we requested to put together a cooperative project between the county, the State and the city where we joined together in the creation of a public art space to show off our public—our respective public art collections. It was a wonderful catalyst in giving us a real program where we could actually substantively do something rather than rely totally upon rhetoric as is so often the case.

I think as a result of that program, it has brought the three agencies much closer together and I think it has strengthened as the program has strengthened, indeed, the Seattle Arts Commission's programs and I am sure the counties'. I think that enables the State Arts Commission to realize its goals of making the arts accessible to people throughout the State.

Kjris, do you want to——

Ms. LUND. I agree with Carl on that point. I think another way of looking at the question is seeing the relative advancement of commissions, such as King County's and Seattle's in looking at what is the priority of the State. To duplicate services that we are capable of providing at this local level or to focus its effort in communities in eastern Washington and sections of the State of Washington that are less developed at the local level, at least as far as cultural programs go.

We are getting direct support from the NEA in the Local Test Program. We are coordinating with the State. They, in fact, have put in some money toward our program. But in a more important sense, the NEA's funding at the local level has allowed us to operate our program without having to burden the State in duplicating services in the community.

Mr. LOWRY. Is the State moving now for a greater emphasis in the rural areas of the State?

Ms. LUND. I think we are always part of—like the challenge of King County—of the balance between the city and the unincorporated areas. Likewise, the State is aggressively trying to develop touring and more programs in eastern Washington and more rural sections, while still addressing issues within the metropolitan area. But I think some of that is still sorting itself out. I don't think the Local Test Program has been a hindrance to that.

Mr. LOWRY. Thank you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Skinner, in your efforts to try to encourage private—potential private donors to contribute to the arts, how do you approach that? What kind of an effort do you and others use to convince folks in the private sector to contribute?

Mr. SKINNER. Well, we—I think one strong argument as has been mentioned this morning, is to appeal to their selfish interest, that the quality of life in the area in which they are doing business. The higher it is, the better it is for their business, the better it is for their customers, for their stockholders and for their employees.

So, that is—I think it is a strong argument. The effort that we made some years ago to appeal to the corporate community to support the annual operating funds of not only the major, but a number of minor cultural activities here came in the form of a united art fund or now what we call the Corporate Council for the Arts, where each year, on a United Fund drive, corporations willingly support in varying amounts. I hope that this invites another question: Some give more than others, obviously. Some do not give as much as they should. But we just keep beating the drum. I think we have been reasonably successful. Every year, we have generated more funds for that purpose. And last year we reached an amount in excess of $1.3 million.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you find that you have greater success, and, by this, I do not necessarily dollar volume, but rather the incidence of giving, do you have greater success with the larger corporations in the area or with smaller business?

Mr. SKINNER. The larger corporations, I think, support programs such as those in the cultural area primarily because they have more dollars to work with; but I think they are also more knowledgeable and more aware of the need. I think small companies, many of which are just started by entrepreneurs do not have the dollars available, they are still scratching to make it, and probably as important, they are not as aware of their responsibility to support activities such as this.

We have an example where now one of our largest companies, they were slow to accept responsibility, MicroSoft may be a word that you are familiar with. And they have been dramatically successful in doing their thing. But it was not up until just the last year or so that its leadership suddenly recognized that they were not doing what they needed to do. And they are really making a strong effort, now, to be responsible. So, I think it is not just the size, it is the attitude of the CEO and his awareness of his responsibility.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you.

Ms. Lund, despite probably a popular perception to the contrary, the Congress is interested in efficiency in delivery systems. And we try to encourage it where we can. [Laughter]

You spoke as did Mr. Petrick about what occurred to me to be a rather complex network of art groups just in this locality. Is the mechanism provided by the National Endowment sufficient to create efficiency in dealing with that large network of arts groups, agencies and the rest?

Ms. LUND. There is a large network within King County. As you were speaking, I was thinking: It is minor compared to the number of special districts and special governmental units we have in King County. I think there are over 400 such units who are all bumping into each other and whose service areas overlap. So, in the case of the arts, it seems rather streamline to have perhaps 20-some arts councils located countywide.

I do think that as Congress reviews the NEA and looks at the Local Test Program, we should always keep in mind the division of labor, if you will, between the State and the local level of government and how we can be more efficient in granting and regranting funds at the local level.

One of the things that we have begun doing, as I mentioned, is meeting on a monthly basis with suburban arts commissions. Carl's office and mine work closely together. We are working, also, with the State of Washington to keep communication going so that we do not have the duplication of services. The kind of funding that comes from the NEA, I think predictability and assurances of amounts of money help make for efficiency. It is when it is uncertain and when it is here 1 year and not the next that it becomes difficult and you have to keep starting up your systems and closing them down.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That latter problem is one that Congress has a great deal of difficulty in resolving and that is the uncertainty about the future funding in what we refer to as the "out years."

I do not know if the American people would be supportive of a longer set of range, a longer leash on the funding process. We wonder in the Congress if that would interfere with our responsiveness to the public demands. If we funded programs for a 3- or 4-year period, would that take responsiveness out of the mix? I do not know. It may be begging the issue, but it is one that the Congress is aware of and worries a lot about.

Mr. Petrick, maybe you want to respond to the basic question.

Mr. PETRICK. The basic question, sir, was regarding the Endowment requirements and whether it allows for a streamlined process right here in the county.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. PETRICK. I think the importance of the Endowment program is it recognizes what the objectives are at the local level. King County has arts objectives that are different, oftentimes, than the City of Seattle. Again, I think the beauty of the program for the Federal Government is that it allows for that self-determination at the local level.

The 3-year time period of funding under this program, I think we need some 3-year programs. I think we also need 1-year programs, also. I think we need a mix and a balance, as indeed the challenge grant and advancement grant programs at the Endowment are multiyear, as is this program. Most of the Endowment programs really rely upon or allow for that responsiveness to the needs from

the arts community throughout the nation. So, I would just encourage—I do not see it extending, necessarily, into 5 years or 10 years, but that 3 years gives us a chance to make something happen in a significant way. I think as long as we keep the 1-year funding deadlines and opportunities for people, we keep it well in balance. That is an opinion from the hinterlands. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Ms. Meltzer, as you know, the arts in education efforts are broken into artists residency and the planning money and then the State grants. The money for the residencies is being reduced. The high water mark was $5 million. In 1988, we are talking about $4 million and in 1989, $3.5 million and probably on down. And then we are enhancing with that money the other two. Is that a good idea or bad idea? Here?

Ms. MELTZER. The Seattle School District is a recipient of that program, as well as the local program that was just described. We have been involved with that other program for about 9 years. It is a significant program. It brings many artists in residence into our buildings. It is in fact a lot of the modeling for this program came from that because it was the first.

I grapple with this. The other side of developing quality sequential arts education in our country today is a very important issue. I am not really sure that it is the role of arts agencies to do that. I would like to see State departments of education and arts agencies talk about it. I would hate to see—"Rob Peter to pay Paul," though. I think those programs are very important and they work very well with the programs we have just described. None of them touch all of our students or all of our teachers, but the combinations can affect an enormous part of that.

I think we have a lot to learn about what arts education is from these programs. But to diminish the artists residency program and put in its place this opportunity to explore what we need to do for arts education in our country, I am not really convinced that is the way to go.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We are not either. It is the result of difficulty in Federal funding that is very real right now. I appreciate the candor of your remarks. Those are certainly helpful to us.

Mr. Petrick, we will go away from here convinced that it was our attendance here in Seattle that convinced Charlie Royer to announce that the Pilot Arts in Education Program will be permanent. I believe Mike Lowry is convinced that it is his presence that encouraged the good Mayor to do that. [Laughter.]

We know the Mayor is a great supporter of the arts and we appreciate his interest in it and in this hearing and his graciousness in welcoming us last night to the City.

Well, you have all been very helpful to us. This hearing has been helpful. We find out sometimes a little bit, sometimes a lot, at a time in these hearings as we go around to critical places such as Seattle. And, sometimes, the people, if we get real lucky, sometimes people who testify come away with some new thoughts, too.

Let me ask you to consider this. I say this not in an effort to lobby you, but just as a new thing you might come away with. As you know, America is a big place, a lot of variety in this country and a lot of differences. In some ways in King County, you are blessed with a closeness, a good many people, a good many agencies

and art groups, museums and the rest of it, corporations, that because of their proximity one to another, are able to find unanimity of opinion and goals.

In some places, not far from here in the west, the towns are a long way apart. And so are the art museums. They find it very difficult to come together either physically or for the purposes of a consortium for funding. We do not know how to solve this two-to-one matching $150,000 limit because there are two good sides to that story. But as you work with other folks around the region, which I know you do, we encourage you, as we encourage them, when we refer to the way you do it here, to be sensitive to the differences and, you know, that sensitivity makes it easier for us not only to get along, but to add assistance one to the other, which is what has made King County such a wonderful place in this country and made Seattle the great, truly great international city that it is.

Well, again, we are pleased that you came with us to share your thoughts. We want to thank Larry, who is the Chief of Staff for the Minority on this committee and Gray, who is the Chief of Staff for the Majority, for preparing this hearing, which is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows.]

National Assembly of State Arts Agencies, 1010 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Suite 920, Washington, D.C. 20005 (202) 347-6352

STATEMENT

SUBMITTED BY THE

NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF STATE ARTS AGENCIES

TO THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

OF THE

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HEARING ON THE

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

LOCALS PROGRAM

SEATTLE, WASHINGTON

AUGUST 25, 1987

The success of the National Endowment for the Arts locals program has been measured in dollars, and the impact nationally has been tremendous.

During fiscal years 1984-1987 the Arts Endowment has awarded grants totalling $8 million in its test program of support for the arts from city and county governments. Every federal dollar has generated nearly $7 in new public and private arts support. Of the new funds, $41.2 million are new local and state government dollars, and $15.1 are private sector funds.

This federal initiative designed to reinforce the role of local government as a source of support for the arts offers grants directly to local arts agencies and indirectly through grants to state arts agencies. The state-local partnership grants require a one-to-one match at the state level and local arts agencies must generate sufficient local public funding to equal the combined federal and state funding.

State Support of Locals

Before NEA established its locals test program, state arts agencies had initiated a leadership role in the development of local arts agencies, fostering their own partnerships to carry out the same mandate at the state and local level. Almost all states (36 out of 48 reporting in a recent survey to NASAA) have a full-time community arts coordinator on staff of the state arts agency charged with providing technical assistance to improve planning and management and to develop new resources for the arts locally. Many of the state community arts coordinator positions were spurred by federal funds through the flexibility allowed in the NEA basic state grant, positions which were later picked up by state money. South Carolina is an example of a state which, through its ten regional arts coordinators on staff at the state arts agency, works closely with communities throughout the state.

States grant funds directly to local arts agencies for projects or general operating support. Ohio for example provides general operating support to the major local arts agencies in the state as part of its regular formula grant process. In North Carolina, forty percent of the state arts agency's grants budget goes to local arts programs. In addition, North Carolina several years ago instituted a challenge grant program -- much like the locals test program later established at the federal level -- to encourage local government support for the arts.

Through regranting programs, many locals give away state arts dollars. Fifteen states report programs of block grants to locals by which state funds are regranted for local arts programs at the discretion of the local arts agency.

The strength and capability of local arts agencies is essential to the overall success of public support for the arts in a state. By promoting the development of statewide assemblies of local arts agencies -- which are established now in 28 states -- state arts agencies have helped the systematic development of a network of support for the arts locally.

State arts agencies recognize that local arts programs will best succeed if organizational development accompanies the resources to fund arts activities. For this reason, the Connecticut Arts Commission and other states in the northeast have pooled funds to set up at the Yale School of Organizational Management a leadership institute for local arts agency managers to address skills in planning and financial and program development necessary for the professionalization of local arts agency administration.

State Objectives/Local Goals

In 1983 when the first grants were awarded by the NEA locals test program, six states participated working through 58 local arts agencies, along with five grants made directly to localities. Since then 43 grants have been awarded by the Endowment in thirty states to benefit a total of 198 local arts agencies. Among those are sixteen states and special jurisdictions which have received NEA locals grants to build support to the arts through city and county government.

States have been drawn to the NEA locals program because the objectives and essential features of the federal effort complement the existing program of support many state arts agencies offer to locals:

- promote increased and sustained public funding for the arts;
- improve the administration of local funds by enhancing the capabilities of local arts agencies; and
- encourage joint planning among state arts agencies, local arts agencies, arts organizations, artists and public officials.

States which had always offered general operating support to locals as part of the state agency's program have used the NEA locals grant to provide increases in their community support.

In Ohio, for example, the locals program fit well in advancing the objectives of the existing program of general operating support for major local arts agencies. With the new NEA dollars the Ohio Arts Council has concentrated on raising money for the arts in smaller towns while promoting inter-agency planning at the local level. In Lima the arts council gained increased revenues from the hotel/motel tax to work in promoting tourism for the city, and the Toledo arts commission used its funding for a downtown redevelopment project.

State legislators have responded well in meeting the state match of federal funds, not the least because local government is sharing the load. The Nebraska Arts Council was among the first states to receive a locals grant from NEA. Now that the federal grant has ended, the Nebraska legislature has voted to continue state funding for the local support program, and next year state appropriations will double to pick up the federal share of funds for local arts agencies.

Results

State arts agencies have, through the NEA locals program, integrated federal funds for local arts agencies into a larger network of support in the following ways:

- increased state appropriations for support of local arts agencies;
- improved interagency planning for the arts at the state and local levels;
- improved awareness of locals among state agency programs and council members;
- enhanced the status of local arts agencies as integral partners in community cultural decision-making;
- developed attitudes at the local level of responsibility for support of the arts, including and beyond a financial commitment;
- helped local political and civic leaders realize the significance of the arts to the community;
- strengthened networks of local arts agencies; and
- encouraged locals to take advantage of other funding sources.

Program Needs/Management Concerns

The amount of public funds, both state and local, matched to the federal dollar from NEA has been high and a proven success for the locals program. Understandably, the level of increased local public money has not been uniform across communities. In one state receiving a locals test program grant, two major cities were forced to drop out of the program with the state arts agency because they were unable to come up with the required matching funds.

Once the federal funding has withdrawn, what are the chances that local funding will continue? One state with a largely rural population has suggested that the results will be good if 30-50% of the local sites retain their local government match.

What accounts for the ability of one local arts agency to do better than another at procuring and keeping local public funding? NEA's evaluation of the locals test program suggests that "successful local matching is clearly not a guarantee of...a sound program." The University of Southern Maine report goes on to say, "Of all the elements critical to success at the local level, planning is...the most significant factor determining whether higher levels of appropriations will be sustained."

State arts agencies have recognized the importance of planning assistance. The efforts of the Oregon Arts Commission over several years to improve local arts management has resulted in routine long-range planning in many local agencies. California, through its program of planning grants to community arts agencies, had enabled Santa Barbara to develop a county-wide arts plan which was in place when the county arts commission received its locals grant from NEA.

Where state arts agencies had built planning into their existing programs of support to local arts agencies, the NEA locals program appears to have been more successful. However, the planning and political skills and inter-agency partnerships crucial to the successful development of local public arts funding are not brought into being by the program itself. Technical assistance is essential to support the principles of sound local arts agency management.

Indeed the evaluation of the locals test program recommends that NEA "should consider how the program might be modified to produce planning enhancements at the state level that will broaden successful participation...and search for ways to assist LAA's...to improve their planning capability."

MICHAEL A. CROMAN
Executive Director

STATE OF WASHINGTON
WASHINGTON STATE ARTS COMMISSION
110-9th & Columbia Bldg. Mail Stop GH-11 • Olympia, Washington 98504-4111 • (206) 753-3860

To: Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education
U.S. House of Representatives

From: Michael A. Croman, Executive Director
Washington State Arts Commission

Date: August 24, 1987

Subject: Written Testimony - National Endowment for the Arts' Local Arts Program

For many years the Washington State Arts Commission has been committed to the development of local arts agencies and activities in order to assist in the implementation of its stated agency goals:

1. To improve availability of and access to the arts for all citizens
2. To conserve and develop the state's artistic resources: its artists, works of art, and arts institutions
3. To advocate society's need for the arts
4. To enhance education through the involvement of professional artists in all the disciplines in school and other educational settings.

While all of the Washington State Arts Commission programs interact with local arts agencies to some degree, particular responsibility for this area of concern lies with the Community Development Program. This program provides resources, technical assistance, on-site consultations, and facilitation of networking for more than 50 identified local arts agencies throughout the state.

Washington's state program for local agencies is but one link in the federal/state/local partnership which must exist to truly serve the needs of the citizens in communities throughout the nation. The state can serve as the "middleman" to facilitate the flow of information and resources in an effective and efficient manner to and from the local communities.

continued...

Written Testimony

The Washington State Arts Commission has not been a direct recipient of assistance from the National Endowment for the Arts' Local Arts program although several communities in the state have been assisted with grants funding. These communities are best suited to answer specific questions concerning the effectiveness of the existing program. WSAC, however, did attempt to form a consortium of smaller local arts organizations which could project the acquisition of new local government funds if additional funds could be found from the state and from the National Endowment for the Arts. This pioneering effort was thwarted by the lack of a state appropriation sufficient to mount a grant application to the NEA and by the limited amount of local government funds which were projected by the involved communities. This attempt to serve smaller communities has made the Washington State Arts Commission particularly conversant with the Locals Program application procedures and grant requirements.

One particular problem which WSAC has identified is the inability of small, particularly rural communities to generate new local government public dollars for arts concerns. Many small communities have an extremely limited tax base, which is currently being tautly stretched to meet even basic services such as police and fire protection, education, etc. In an era when agriculturally-based economies are not expected to show great profits, it is unrealistic to anticipate that additional tax monies will be appropriated to culturally oriented concerns. The lack of alternate economic bases makes it impossible for rural communities to have access to assistance from the National Endowment for the Arts; only more urban communities with a more eclectic tax base can successfully leverage additional public monies to meet the matching requirements of the NEA Locals Program. A more realistic approach, which would assure equal access to the NEA funds, would be to allow other sources of "new" money (corporate, business, foundation and private funds) as matching funds for the program.

As local arts agencies become stronger and grow more able to meet the needs of their local constituents, it is important for all members of the federal/state/local partnership to re-assess their respective roles and responsibilities to their constituents: who bears the major responsibility for nationally recognized institutions? Who should serve the needs of emerging artists? Who should serve the technical assistance needs of developing sponsors? These and other questions are a natural outgrowth of the developing awareness of local communities and concern for their cultural climate. Each of the partners can be supportive of the others in the partnership through different types of activities: some are best handled and developed at a federal level, others at a state level, and still others at a local level. The national arts movement is a relatively new one which is currently experiencing the actualization of the oft-sought "grass-roots" support for the arts. A flexible, visionary approach must be maintained in order to meet the needs of local arts agencies as they emerge, develop, grow and become stable parts of the fabric of our communities. The Washington State Arts Commission is committed to this partnership and urges the National Endowment for the Arts to continue its dedication and focus on the issues and concerns of local arts agencies as refected in the Local Program.

OREGON COAST COUNCIL FOR THE ARTS

August 21, 1987

The Honorable Pat Williams
House Committee on Post Secondary
Education,
House of Representatives
Washington, D. C. 20515

Re: Oversight Hearing, 8/25/87 - NEA Locals Program

Dear Representative Williams:

Thank you for convening a regional hearing about the National Endowment for the Arts' Locals Program. Although I will not be present, please consider these comments as part of your facts gathering.

The Locals Program has done more to enco and nurture the arts at the community level than any oth gle program other than Artists in Education. The requirement that the match must be achieved from public dollars insures that.

Since local governments are primarily concerned with basic services and economic development, coherent conversation with these bodies can only be attained when arts administrators research and articulate arts concerns within a structure familiar to public officials. It has been an energizing study for arts providers. Local and state agencies are seeing new opportunities for the arts to interface with tourism, cultural entrepeneurship, world trade and social renewal programs.

Oregon received one of the first State Locals grants. (The provision for states to apply on behalf of a consortia of small arts agencies assures access even within the large minimum grant allocation.) Our Council participated and the program initiated a relationship with our local governments that belies our rural, local agency status.

Newport, a coastal city of 8,000, has been a partner with the Council in developing facilities and programs that are funded at more than three million dollars! Lincoln City, with a similar population, has

P.O. Box 1315 • Newport, Oregon 97365 • 265-923

embarked on a Design of American Cities project with the Council that is a direct spinoff of the confidence and credibility established through our mutual work with the Locals grant.

The increased allocation by the Oregon Legislature to the Oregon Arts Commission had to be influenced by the concert of arts advocates that included informed and supportive local public officials. Arts people knew the melody, but the harmony provided by elected peers made the significant difference that moved Oregon from its 51st position in state arts funding.

We ought not to overlook the side effect that these new relationships, joint planning and responsive partnerships has created - citizens and officials hugely more suited to democracy.

By making important funding more broadly available the National Endowment for the Arts is nurturing excellence in the arts as well as being able to honor it where it already exists. The Locals Program touches emerging artists with high potential through their local arts agencies which are best positioned to access their needs and value.

I have enclosed an extract prepared by a co-panelist for the 1985 National Assembly for Locals Arts Agencies conference who served with me in a discussion of the Locals Program. It offers clear evidence that "Yes" the Locals Program is making a difference - a positive one- in the rural sector as well as in urban areas.

Again, thank you for your concern and thoughtful consideration of these issues.

Sincerely,

Sharon Morgan

Sharon Morgan
Executive Director

BUTLER COUNTY ARTS COUNCIL
Box 185
David City, Nebraska 68632

WHAT HAS THE LOCALS TEST PROGRAM DONE FOR BUTLER COUNTY??

--Performances by storyteller Duane Hutchinson in county grade schools. Many teachers used materials provided by Duane Hutchinson to teach their own units on gathering local history from parents and grandparents.

--Upgrading of entertainment at County Fair. This year's program by Tom T. Hall is funded in part by Locals Test Program match money. This improved programming will draw business from outside the county, as well as contributing to local enthusiasm for the entire county fair.

--Workshops in 3 of 4 county high schools by the 52nd Street Breakers. Provided exposure to minority artists.

--Performance in Brainard by Boston's Chamber Repertory Theatre. Provided an opportunity for Butler County residents to see professional actors from Boston here in our own backyard.

--Expansion of County Band Day into a two-day residency, providing band students with in-depth exposure to a professional musician.

--Increase in Arts Council advertising budget, including publication of a publicity brochure. Better promotion for the services and performances brought to Butler County by the Arts Council.

--Auditing of Butler County Arts Council books, to assure members and contributors of our proper handling of finances.

METROPOLITAN ARTS COMMISSION
PORTLAND, OREGON

September 4, 1987

The Honorable Pat Williams
House Committee on Post-Secondary Education
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

REF: Oversight Hearing in Seattle, August 25th

Dear Representative Williams,

I understand that your hearing in Seattle was very successful, and I regret that my schedule did not allow me to attend. I hope, however, that this letter may be included in as part of the record of that hearing.

I have some history with the NEA State/Locals Test Program, now the Local Programs. I was on the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies (NALAA) Board of Directors when the program was developed at the NEA and as President of NALAA, represented that organization on the first NEA Locals Panel. I served on that panel for the duration of the test period, which ended last fall. I was also a member of the group invited to the Wye Plantation for a retreat to discuss the program. In addition, my arts commission was among the first round of grantees through the Oregon application. We received $150,000 over a three year period.

The locals grant to my arts commission has had a profound effect on our organization as well as on the City of Portland. It would take far too much time to list all of our activities as a result of these funds, but let me mention some highlights.

In terms of funding, the federal money leveraged the required 1:1 match of new city and county general fund dollars. Those funds stayed in place at the end of the grant period. In addition, the NEA funds leveraged $12,000 in planning grants, $225,000 in funds from the school district for public art, $475,000 in funds from the regional government for public art and $6,000 in special private donations. These funds do not even include the match for our regranting funds to arts organizations, which was well over $100,000.

1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Room 516
Portland, Oregon 97204-1983
(503) 796-5111

Commissioners
Sara Perry
Chairperson
John Osburn
Vice Chairperson
Elizabeth Cappe
Doris Carlsen
Ed Carpenter
Robert D. Geddes
Thomas Higgins
Manuel Izquierdo
Robert Jackson, Jr.
Richard Lakeman
Mary Anne Normandin
Betty Schedeen
Ellen Wong
Paul Yarborough

Executive Director
Selina R. Olium

An agency of the
City of Portland
and Multnomah County

City Liaison
Commissioner Mike Lindberg
County Liaison
Commissioner Polly Casterline

Member of the National
Assembly of Local
Arts Agencies

We have at the end of these three years, two new Percent for Public Art ordinances, arts policies in our Downtown Plan, a new Metropolitan Center for Public Art, an on-going technical assistance program, significantly increased excellence in the artistic programming of two of our mid-sized arts organizations and an entirely new scope and image of our arts commission. In addition, we have a strategy for increasing funds to benefit our major institutions and for developing a new dedicated fund for the arts. As you might imagine, the change as a result of the Test Program has been exciting, challenging and gratifying.

Most of my concerns about the Local Programs have been reflected in the new guidelines. I do agree with NALAA's position that private funds should be allowed as a match in conjunction with public funds and hope that that change may be made in the future. Public funds should remain the heart of the program, however.

We need more money. Arts councils across the country are ready to develop new sources of local support, but they need the NEA leverage in order to do so. I urge your support of a $8 million program base. There are few programs in this country where so little can do so much in a community.

Chairman Hodsoll, as you know, was the force behind the Local Programs and has done an outstanding job in overseeing their development. I hope you will work closely with his office, as his perspective on the importance of this program is one which I of course share.

Thank you very much for your attention to the NEA and please let us know if we can be of help.

Sincerely,

Selina R. Ottum

Selina R. Ottum
Executive Director

cc: Representative Les AuCoin
Chairman Francis S.M. Hodsoll